AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

NEW SERIES—VOL. IV.—(XIV.)—APRIL, 1896.—NO. 4.

THE EDUCATION OF CATHOLIC DEAF-MUTES IN THE UNITED STATES.

THE condition of the *uneducated* deaf-mute is pitiful. Walled in by silence, solitary, ignorant, unable to communicate with his kind except by signs and harsh cries, treated as a pariah that is a shame and burden to his family, shut out from the enjoyments of refined society, incompetent to earn a decent living, hopeless of a career of distinction, untaught by religion, he grows up little better than an animal, dwarfed in soul, stunted in intellect, caring only for physical comforts, envious of more fortunate men, malicious, spiteful, bitter and consumed with silent discontent for the fate that has made him as he is. His lot is hard to bear.

Even when his mind is instructed in the rudiments of knowledge and his hand is trained to some useful employment, his state is still deplorable, for, unless religion brings to his aid fortitude to bear his cross in patience, and grace to make a virtue of necessity, his affliction is apt to be a hindrance to the attainment of his end here and hereafter.

Now, what is the Church in the United States doing for its deaf-mutes?

The United States census of 1890 reported that the total number of deaf and dumb in the country then was 40,562. Of these 15,371 were between five and twenty years of age,

of whom 6,153 were in the fifty-five institutions which had sent in statistics to the Government. At present there are 10,679 deaf-mutes collected in the fifty-five public and thirty-four private[1] schools in operation, and of them only about 800 are in Catholic institutions, although the number of our afflicted ones must be between 8,000 and 10,000, and the number of those between the ages of five and twenty must be nearly 2,500.

Thousands of Catholic deaf children have been trained in the State institutions, for the first school for mutes in this country was opened at Hartford, Conn., in 1817, whereas no Catholic school was organized until 1836, in St. Louis, and this was done in a small way, while already there were five public or distinctively Protestant asylums in operation. At present we have only ten out of eighty-two institutions, and half of these are insignificant, struggling and poorly attended.

It is no exaggeration to say that a majority of the thousands of Catholic children who have been educated in the State institutions during the past eighty years, have lost the faith, and the thousand and odd now in our "non-sectarian" public institutions, are in almost certain danger of being lost to the Church. For they have gone from home uninstructed in religion, and in those establishments they have found few Catholic teachers and no influence that is in favor of the Church. They have had no opportunity to go to Mass on Sunday, no encouragement to observe the laws of abstinence as prescribed by their religion, no preparation for the reception of the Sacraments. They are often surrounded by non-Catholic companions who have ridiculed the sign of the cross. Many of them have studied in their text books of history and in the volumes of their library misrepresentations of Catholic doctrines and doings. They have lived, frequently, in an atmosphere of prejudice against Catholics, and they have been infected with its malaria. It is but natural that these children, having no other instructors, should have accepted as the indisputable truth whatever has

1 This is the latest account as given in the *American Annals of the Deaf*, January 1896, published at Washington, D. C.

been taught them; while their teachers in many cases have endeavored to proselyte them.

The principal of St. Joseph's Institute testifies on this point:

"We endeavor to give our pupils all the advantages that are offered them in other institutions, but in spite of this it is probable that no less than one-third of our Catholic deaf-mutes enter Protestant institutions, from which in the course of a few years they return, Catholics in name only and often not even this. The number of deaf-mutes there educated is very large.—A Sunday school has been opened for their instruction at St. Francis Xavier's, New York City. The classes are well attended, but it is almost impossible to remove the prejudices which they have imbibed in these institutions and it is no unusual thing for them to disavow all belief in the Real Presence."

Referring to a case of apostacy of which he had heard, Mr. P. M. Whelan, of Philadelphia, a cleric who has dedicated his life to work for deaf-mutes, states:

"I could enumerate many similar instances. On the present occasion I shall content myself with one. A class was in preparation for First Communion. One boy, somewhat bolder than the rest, said he did'nt want to go to Holy Communion, but that, if he did go, it would only be to cast the sacred particle on the ground as soon as he had received it. This threat he followed up by saying that the Catholics were liars and deceivers. When asked where he had learned all this, he replied, in a book which he had read at school."

The Rev. P. Fallon, of Alton, Illinois, declares:

"If we cannot trust to the home training of those among our children who have all their senses and who may be corrected at home if they have any false ideas concerning religion, how infinitely less can we trust these poor deaf-mutes who cannot imbibe their religion with their mother's milk; who cannot hear a word of religion or perceive any idea of God till they receive instruction from their teachers. These poor children of the silent world receive all their intellectual knowledge from the teachers who instruct them, and no doubt the heart of many a Catholic mother has been rent with grief when her son or daughter, returning from a State institution, has announced that he or she is opposed to the Catholic Church."

Similar testimony can be had from teachers in all Catholic deaf-mute institutions, and their unanimous opinion, to put it in one sentence, is that to send a Catholic child to a State institution is, as a rule, to condemn it to the loss of its faith.

Our Protestant neighbors have been most zealous in their care of the deaf. Not content with their evangelizing operations conducted through State institutions, they support

clergymen who go from place to place ministering to the afflicted. The Rev. Mr. Gallaudet and his two clerical assistants do their utmost to make their Church in the city of New York, the resort of the deaf-mutes of that city, and they have provided a library, a reading room and other attractions of a similar character for their exclusive use. The Rev. E. O. Dantzer, a deaf-mute, once himself a Catholic, now a parson, visits central New York. The Rev. Job Turner, also a deaf-mute, takes charge of his fellow sufferers throughout Virginia and adjacent regions. The Rev. J. H. Cloud, a deaf-mute, holds religious services in Missouri. Mr. Moylon, a deaf-mute, formerly a Catholic, now a lay reader among the Episcopalians, works for his kind in Maryland. The Rev. J. M. Keohler is pastor of a deaf-mute congregation in Philadelphia and makes regular missionary excursions throughout Pennsylvania. These are only some of the more zealous Protestants who are at work in this field. They keep track of all deaf-mutes within their respective territories. They invite all of them to re-unions of deaf-mutes conducted by them. They sympathize with them, aid them, find them employment, hold religious services for them, keep in touch with them—no wonder that they hold all their own to Protestantism and draw some Catholics from the faith !

We Catholics have neglected our deaf-mutes. If we had not, there should be in our schools more than 800 out of our 8,000 to 10,000. Only in eight out of forty-five States have we as much as one school for them. Only a handful of our 10,000 priests know the sign language. And the very few schools that we have, are treated by the Catholic public with cruel indifference and suffered to sink or swim as best they can. In New York they have State aid ; outside of that commonwealth, God only knows how they get along. In the Ephpheta School, in Chicago, during the winter of 1893-94, the Sisters were so destitute that they had to sell various articles of their convent furniture to obtain money for current expenses, and, when they had disposed of everything they could spare, they were forced by absolute want to go out into the city every day after their exhausting labors

in the class-rooms, to beg for food in order that they might keep their pupils and themselves from starvation. They thought of themselves last, and some of them, stinting themselves to save the children from hunger and cold, broke down in health under the strain of labor, anxiety and privation.

In a private letter, one of the nuns devoted to this work in another locality writes:

"It is certainly a great pity that Catholics show so little regard for these afflicted children and have allowed the work to pass almost entirely from their hands; while the name of Gallaudet is honored throughout the land for his labors among the deaf, the name of the devoted Abbé de l'Epée (who kindly imparted to Gallaudet the method of instruction he himself had invented, and even furnished the latter with a teacher, one of his own pupils) is almost unknown in America." Another Sister says: "I sincerely hope that your article will stir up some interest in deaf-mutes and induce generously-disposed persons to turn their attention towards this afflicted portion of the community and aid the Catholic schools which are struggling to give them an education."

Now, where are these Catholic deaf-mute schools, and what are they doing?

1. To Bishop Rosati, of St. Louis, and to the Sisters of St. Joseph belongs the credit of starting the first Catholic institution for deaf-mutes in the United States. In 1836, at the invitation of that apostolic prelate, Sister St. John and Sister Celestine came from Lyons, France, where they had been trained for the work, and opened a school in the city of Carondelet.[1] It was transferred to St. Louis in 1861, and

1 The following pertinent passage is taken from the "*Life of Mother St. John Fontbonne*," foundress of the Order of Sisters of St. Joseph:

"In 1837, the little Community had the inexpressible consolation of welcoming two additional Sisters from Lyons, Sister Celestine, afterwards Superior of Carondelet, and Sister St. John, the foundress, some years later, of the Congregation of Philadelphia. These two religious, who, in 1836, had been sent to Saint-Etienne to prepare themselves for the instruction of the deaf-mutes on the American mission, had been long and anxiously expected. The Bishop was informed of their departure from Brest on the 17th of April, 1837; but as months rolled by, bringing no tidings of the travellers, both he and the Sisters gave them up as lost. The vessel, meanwhile, had put in at the West Indies; and it was only in September that the two Sisters, having reached St. Louis by way of New Orleans, presented themselves to the Bishop. He, however, would not, at first, believe they were the Sisters of whose coming he had despaired; and to assure himself of their identity, he

was known as St. Brigid's Deaf Mute Institute, having from thirty to forty pupils. But as the school was in connection with St. Brigid's Orphan Asylum, the building became too small for both purposes. So, in 1883, the mutes were sent to Hannibal, where ample accommodations awaited them. Shortly afterwards the community purchased the site of the present Mariae Consilia Institute, on Cass avenue, St. Louis, and enlarged the building then on the ground so as to furnish plenty of room for the girls. These, in 1885, were brought back to the chief city of Missouri, to the joy of the parents of those among them who resided in and near it, who had objected to the rearing of their little ones where they could rarely see them.

Two years later, the boys were also brought back to St. Louis, and the Hannibal deaf-mute school was permanently closed.

But as the pupils increased in number, the accommodations of the St. Louis institution again became insufficient, and the boys were removed to a boarding and day school at Longwood Place, in the southern part of the city. This school was named St. Joseph's Institute for Deaf-Mutes. The Mariae Consilia School is for girl boarders, of whom it has now thirty-eight, and for boy day-scholars, of whom it has four. St. Joseph's Institute has fifteen pupils.

bade them converse before him in the sign-language. Whether or not they had their letter of obedience the Annals do not say; if they had, probably the Bishop feared its authenticity. This reception, serious though it was, had its ludicrous aspect, and the tired and, it would seem, hungry travellers, were somewhat at a loss for a subject on which to converse. But there was no alternative. Prove themselves to be the deaf-mute teachers they must, so Sister Celestine, turning to Sister St. John, asked in signs, "What are you thinking of, Sister?" to which the latter in all the simplicity of truth, replied: "I am thinking of the bread we ate in France." So unexpected and evidently so candid an acknowledgement overset Sister Celestine's gravity, and she could not restrain a laugh. The Bishop insisted on knowing what had been said, and whether or not hunger was a sufficient proof of their being the expected travellers, it would appear they had to undergo no further examination. Going to a closet in the room, the Bishop took therefrom a piece of brown bread, which he gave to Sister St. John with the injunction to eat it."

In both schools the combined system of instruction is used. The manual alphabet, pantomime, writing, speech and lip-reading are all employed. Thirteen of the Mariae Consilia pupils and a few of the boys in St. Joseph's receive special training in articulation and lip-reading, and have attained a notable degree of proficency.

Last summer Dr. M. A. Goldstein introduced a system of training for the auditory nerve. This system has achieved astonishing results by developing in persons apparently altogether deaf not only the sense of perception, but also that of differentiation of sound.

The girls are taught plain and fancy needle-work, drawing and painting, cooking and house work. They attend Mass every morning in the chapel. The older girls belong to a Sodality which brings them together every Sunday afternoon for a special instruction by the Rev. Chaplain. A library is also at their disposal to render useful their hours of leisure.

The two schools receive no aid from City or State. They are supported mainly by the endeavors of the Community in charge of them, for, although a tuition fee is exacted from those who are able to pay it, no pupil of good morals, capable of being instructed, is rejected for want of means.

Over 300 deaf-mutes have been educated by the Sisters of St. Joseph in these schools, since the beginning was made sixty years ago.

The Catholic inmates of the Illinois State Institution for Deaf-Mutes, at Jacksonville, receive instruction in their catechism from Mr. Edward Cleary, who is himself a deaf-mute, and one of the regular teachers of the institution. But this is done outside of school hours and on Sundays, without remuneration, as it is strictly forbidden to any instructor to broach religious subjects during the ordinary school hours. He took this extra work upon himself at the request of the Rev. Father Crowe, and has deserved the gratitude of parents and pupils by this service done them for God's sake.

2. Le Couteulx St. Mary's Institute.—In the autumn of the year 1853, an association was incorporated in the city of

Buffalo, N. Y., called "Le Couteulx St. Mary's Benevolent Society for the Deaf and Dumb," to aid and instruct the Catholic mutes of that region. It was named after its first treasurer, Mr. Louis Le Couteulx de Caumont, who was in his day a distinguished benefactor to charity. Its first president was Bishop Timon. An acre lot was given to the new institution by the former and three small frame cottages by the latter. In 1857, three Sisters of St. Joseph, who had acquired a knowledge of the sign language and methods of instruction at Caen in France, and who were then in St. Louis, were invited to Buffalo to take charge of the school. But they had to start a regular day-school for children who were not deaf-mutes, to enable them to support the house and to equip it for the care of the deaf. In 1859, they began their real life-work with four deaf-mute girls as boarders and a few boys as day-scholars. But they did not, it appears, receive sufficient support and had to suspend their classes for a while, although through the encouragement and help given them by the Bishop, they were enabled, in 1862, to resume their instruction. From that time onward their institution steadily developed until it reached its present grand proportions. Besides its city property, it has a branch place with twenty-three acres, for the smaller boys, about two miles and a half from its main structure. It has spent $110,000 for buildings and grounds. In 1871, it was allowed by the Legislature to receive deaf-mute children under twelve years of age as county beneficiaries, and the next year it was authorized to receive State pupils.

The whole number of pupils so far admitted to the school is about 600. It has now some 150, of whom about 70 are supported by the State of New York, about 50 by counties, 20 by parents and friends, and 10 by the institution.

The system of instruction used is the combined—sign and and oral. Articulation or "improved instruction" was introduced in 1870, after two of the teachers had been trained in "visible speech" by Professor A. G. Bell. But his method of symbols was gradually dropped and the German plan, or method of imitation, was adopted in its stead.

In 1874, industrial training was introduced. It began with chair-caning and needlework. Now the boys are taught printing, tailoring, shoemaking, chair-caning and wood-carving, and the girls are instructed in sewing, dressmaking, cooking fancy work and household duties. All the clothing and shoes required by the pupils are now made in the institution. A weekly magazine, *Le Couteulx Leader*, was founded in 1875, which is set up and printed by pupils, and to which some of them contribute.

The institution sent three exhibits to the World's Fair in Chicago. The first, which was presented to the Department of Public Instruction, consisted of one memory sketch of Bishop Timon's three cottages, twelve photographic views of the present buildings, four water-color pictures, two volumes of exercises in grade work, seven volumes of *Le Couteulx Leader*, and a suit of clothes for a boy. The second, sent to the Collective Exhibit of Schools for the Deaf, consisted of twelve photographic views, two volumes of grade work, and the Columbian edition of the *Leader*. This exhibit, at the request of the U. S. Commissioner of Education, has been presented to the National Pedagogic Museum at Washington, D. C. The third exhibit was made up of three photographic views, one oil painting, ten water-colors, two volumes of grade work, a complete file of the *Leader*, and several specimens of chair-caning and wood-carving. This constituted part of the Buffalo diocesan exhibit.

By experience gained through their own efforts and by frequent visitations to other schools, the Sisters keep St. Mary's among the most successful institutions of its kind in the country.

3. St. Joseph's Institute.—In the year 1869, St. Joseph's Institute for the Improved Instruction of Deaf Mutes was founded in New York by the Ladies of the Sacred Heart of Mary. It has three departments. The original institution is at No. 772 East 188th street (Fordham). It was opened as an academy for young ladies to supply the means to establish a school for the deaf. It had a difficult beginning. Often the Sisters were tempted to despair of gaining a support, and

were it not for the State and county aid that they have received since 1875, they would be unable to take care of the hundreds of children whom they now educate.

A branch house was inaugurated in Brooklyn in 1874 for the purpose of offering to the deaf-mute girls of that city the advantages of a day-school.

A branch school for boys was begun in a rented dwelling in Fordham in 1875, and filled up so rapidly that a commodious villa at Throgg's Neck, West Chester, was purchased for their proper housing.

The number of children attending the three schools in 1894, was 375, of whom 184 were State pupils, 156 county pupils, and 32 private pupils.

The same Sisters conduct St. Elizabeth's Industrial School at 235 East 14th street, New York, which is for speaking children who are destitutes or orphans, but it also receives homeless deaf-mute girls after they leave school. It finds work for them, and, if they so desire, it allows them to live with them, while working out by the day.

Beginning with a Kindergarten, the Sisters go on to instruct the pupils in their three schools the branches usually imparted in primary and grammar classes, equip them for life-work by industrial training, and teach them to be virtuous Christians by the knowledge and practice of religion.

In the early days of the institution, the manual method was followed, but it was soon discarded for the combined, and this was used for several years with a gradual approach to the purely oral. Since 1888, when two of the Sisters visited the model school for the deaf at Bordeaux, France, the oral method has been taken as the standard of the institute. At present about 230 pupils use it, while only 68 employ the combined method.

The boys are taught printing, shoemaking, tailoring, mechanical drawing and wood-working. The girls are instructed in dressmaking, sewing, fancy needlework and household duties.

4. In New York City the Rev. Alfred Belanger, of the Order of St. Viator, labored for several years among our

deaf-mutes until growing ailments obliged him to retire. Since his withdrawal, the Rev. Father Stadelman, S. J., has taken up the work. Every Sunday afternoon he gives an instruction in the College of St. Francis Xavier and then imparts the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. The Xavier Deaf Mute Union, organized about five years ago, offers literary and social advantages. The young men meet every Thursday evening at the College. Last winter they produced a drama, "Judas Maccabaeus," in the sign language. The young women meet twice a week in the rooms of the Notre Dame Club at 71 Seventh avenue. So popular are these reunions, that they attract regular attendants from Brooklyn, Jersey City and other points. It is to be regretted that circumstances prevent their spiritual director from devoting himself to them exclusively. He can give them only a few brief moments after his exacting duties in the College are fulfilled, leaving him no time to visit them in their homes, to inquire into their surroundings, to stir them up to the regular practice of their religious duties, to promote their temporal welfare.

The Society of St. Vincent de Paul, at the last General Convention of its "Conferences" in New York, considered the question of taking up the work for deaf-mutes, and we are sure it will find in that field opportunities for the exercise of its most zealous charity.

5. The Ephpheta School. One day in the year 1884 a poor woman employed as a laundress by Mrs. N. Jones, of Chicago, happened to mention to the latter that there was no Catholic school to which she could send her deaf-mute daughter. The worry of that mother for the soul-training of her afflicted child so affected Mrs. Jones, that, in conjunction with Miss Eliza Allen Starr, she called together a number of prominent Catholic ladies of the city to consider the subject. The meeting was presided over by the Rev. Henry Meurer, C.SS.R., who was deeply interested in its object, having become familiar with the sad fate of several deaf-mutes who had lost the faith because they had not been properly instructed. At this meeting it was first proposed to

establish a fund to send poor Catholic deaf-mutes to some approved school in the country. But it was subsequently resolved to open in Chicago an institution for their moral, mental, physical and industrial training. Accordingly an organization, called the Ephpheta Society, was formed. It was appropriately named from the word Ephpheta, "Be thou opened," used by our Lord when He cured the deaf and dumb person mentioned by St. Mark (vii, 34).

In the autum of that same year, the school was begun. It was placed in the charge of Ladies of the Sacred Heart of Mary. It started with only 2 pupils. At the end of the first year it had 15; at the close of the second, it had 28. It was at first a day school, and for two terms it was located at 433 W. 12th St., where a room was placed at its disposal, rent free, by the Jesuit Fathers of St. Ignatius' College. But soon applications for admission came in behalf of children at a distance from town, even from beyond the borders of the State of Illinois. Thus the urgent need of a boarding school became apparent. In the fall of 1886, a move was made to St. Joseph's Home, 409 S. May St., where accommodations for girl boarders had been procured, and, during the next year, a cottage on the grounds was made ready for the reception of boys. From that time forward, the number of pupils constantly increased, until it reached its present annual average of 105, of whom about 75 are boarders.

Besides the ordinary branches of a common school education, all of the pupils are instructed in free-hand drawing from objects, casts and life. Mechanical drawing, wood carving and modeling in clay, are likewise taught, and the girls are trained in sewing, fancy needlework, embroidery, lace making, dress-making, cooking and house-keeping. The students also write for, illustrate, set up and print the *Ephpheta Paper*, $1.00 a year which is published for the benefit of the institution.

Although the school has no other industrial features than those just mentioned, it has managed to place its graduates, on leaving it, in a position to learn a good trade, and some of

its pupils are now good printers, stone cutters, marble workers, wood carvers, dressmakers, etc.

The school sent an exhibit to the World's Fair that was highly praised. It consisted of class exercises, bound copies of the *Ephpheta Paper*, drawings in pencil and charcoal, modelings from casts and life. A cabinet, designed by a teacher and carved by pupils, was honored with the award of a gold medal, and a diploma was given "for neat habits and good workmanship of the students, and benevolence and good methods of training practiced by the teachers."

The Ephpheta Society disbanded in December, 1892, and the whole responsibility of supporting and conducting the institution devolved on the Sisters in charge. They have struggled along valiantly, but they are still without a building and without a certain income. They receive no aid from City or State, and have to depend on voluntary offerings and on the contributions paid by the parents of the pupils.

What they derive from the latter source is soon told. They charge for board and tuition one hundred dollars a year, two dollars a week. This sum provides for a primary and grammar school education, art and industrial training, food, fuel, light, medical attendance, and, in some cases, clothing. For two years, lately, when they had an average of 72 boarders, they should have received, even at this low rate charged for their support, the sum of $14,400, but the amount that they did get was $2,346, about one-third of a dollar a week per pupil. It is evident that they cannot support the children and themselves and keep up the institution on such terms, and it is easy to believe the report that they have gone hungry themselves more than once for want of the means to buy the commonest necessaries of life. Yet, trusting to Divide Providence and considering the perils of uninstructed souls, they have managed to procure the necessaries of life without turning one deaf-mute from their door, pay or no pay.

The school has ten classes. Speech and speech-reading are taught all the children, although signs and the manual alpha-

bet are not excluded. Recitations are conducted by speech or by writing. Some of the pupils communicate with the teachers and hearing friends almost wholly by speech. Aural training is practiced for those only partially deaf. The *Audigène Verrier*, an invention of Mgr. Verrier, is used for this purpose and with most gratifying results.

If wealthy Catholics in Illinois are concerned to find an object of charity worthy of help, they need look no farther than the Ephpheta School.

6. St. John's Institute.—The Rev. Theo. Bruener, of the Catholic Normal School and Pio Nono College, at St. Francis, Wisconsin, opened there in 1876 a school for deaf mutes. For want of a suitable building he used the second floor of the college gymnasium for three years. Then a three-story brick structure was put up. The institution can accommodate 80 pupils. It has three departments—school, industrial and domestic.

In the school department the children receive a primary and grammar education. The sign language is used principally, although articulation is practised. Professor L. W Mihm has charge of the boys and some Sisters of St. Francis instruct the girls. The younger children spend half of the day in classes and half in the shops.

In the industrial department the boys are taught various trades—carving, carpentering, painting, gilding, frescoing and shoemaking. The institution was once about to fail for lack of means, in 1889, when the then Rev. Director, Father M. M. Gerend, appealed to the late Archbishop Heiss to build workshops for the manufacture of church furniture. It has now the best plant in the Northwest for the making of altars, confessionals, baptismal fonts, pulpits, pews, statues, stations of the cross, and other cabinet and carved work used in ecclesiastical edifices. It turns out $30,000 worth of work a year, and has executed orders for Catholic churches in Wisconsin, Iowa, Illinois, Nebraska, Indiana, Michigan and North Dakota, to the pastors of which it refers for guarantees of its artistic productions. The boys not only help to support themselves and the school, but they also acquire skill in

a handicraft at which they can make their way in the world. Father Gerend says:

"Since the establishment of our industrial department six years have elapsed, and we are now in a condition to form an idea of its merits. It has been a decided success; it has wrought a wonderful change in our boys; it has made men of them. Pupils who have not finished the elementary branches of study spend only a portion of each day in the shops, whilst those who have finished, no longer go to school, but work in the shops only. It is surprising to see how expert these boys become at carving, etc., after working in the shops under efficient teachers for a few years. In order to complete the education of these boys, those that work in the shops only are set free and watched, as it were, from a distance. They have but few rules to comply with, and receive a small compensation for their work, sufficient to make them self-sustaining. With this they pay their board at the Institute, buy their clothes and whatever else they may need. This goes to make them independent, teaches them the value of time and money, and fits them peculiarly to get along when they leave the Institute and are placed on their own responsibility. Boys who know their trade sufficiently well and desire to leave are furnished places in shops, factories, etc. There is always a great demand for good carvers, and we could place any number of them if we only had them. Such boys as have been working away from the Institute have been a credit to us, have given satisfaction to their employers, and have behaved as gentlemen. Graduates desiring to return are welcome. Our Institute will always have its doors open for these unfortunates, and be a home for them."

In the domestic department the girls learn sewing, dress-making, needlework, baking, cooking, etc.

The tuition, including board, washing and medical attendance is $10 a month. But as the school is a diocesan establishment, deaf-mutes of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee who are not able to pay this fee are received, on a certificate from their pastor, for whatever they can afford to give.

Deaf-mutes are admitted between the ages of 8 and 25, and about forty of them are now in the Institute.

7. In Philadelphia.—About sixteen years ago, the Rev. Daniel A. Brennan, pastor of the Church of the Assumption, at that time Chancellor to Archbishop Wood, was induced to interest himself personally in the spiritual care of the Catholic pupils in the Pennsylvania Institution for Deaf and Dumb. The Archbishop gladly seconded his efforts, and the matter was broached to Rev. Mother Mary John, Superior of the Sisters of St. Joseph, who showed herself at

once willing to engage in the work. With this view she sent two of her best teachers to study the sign language and methods of teaching at the Pennsylvania Institute for Deaf Mutes, where they received every attention that liberality and courtesy could dictate. Professor Crouter now Principal of the Institution at Mount Airy, gave his personal attention to the Sisters and promoted by every way in his power, the end they had in view. And here it may be said with grateful acknowledgment, that from that time to the present the same course has been followed by the officers of the State Institution.

The Course begun at the Pennsylvania Institute was continued by one of the Sisters at the Le Couteulx Deaf-Mute Institute of Buffalo under the care of the Sisters of St. Joseph.

Negotiations had in the meantime been entered into with the officers of the Pennsylvania Institute, and it was agreed that the deaf-mutes should be allowed to attend the Cathedral for Mass and religious instruction.[1]

The following is an extract from the Annals of the Congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph, written at that time:

"On Friday, October 14, 1881, Rev. Mother Mary John received a letter from Rev. Father Brennan informing her that the Board had given consent to the Deaf Mutes attending Sunday School. In his letter he said:—Let us all pray hard that God Himself may guide and abundantly bless and aid the venture. I am sure he will bless you, dear Mother, for your warm, earnest efforts to afford means of salvation to his afflicted children. May the blessings be abundant and great indeed!

"On the morning of the fifteenth, Rev. Mother had the Community offer Communion for the success of the work, and urged the Sisters to beg St. Teresa to take under her special protection this undertaking as she had taken the Congregation when on October 15, 1650, the first Sisters of our Order had received the habit and been placed in charge ot the Orphan Asylum at Montferrand. All the Community felt it to be a blessed and happy omen that the work should be inaugurated under the patronage of her who had been from the first a patroness of the Congregation and felt there was a special providence in the letter's having been written on the eve of her feast.

"On Sunday, October 17, the Community again offered Communion for its success and on that day Sisters Arsenia and Patricia began the Sunday School with seventeen pupils."

During all this time the Most Rev. Archbishop Wood and Father Brennan continued to take the liveliest interest in the welfare of these children. His Grace often visited the classes and encouraged them by little rewards in their studies and the observance of discipline. A touching instance of this charity on the part of the noble Archbishop may be here recorded. He was in the habit of spending a few hours with his deaf-mute children every year at Christmas. On the last feast before his death, being unable to leave his room, he sent for the children and made them come into him one after another, distributing to each a little gift of candies. Among those of the Philadelphia clergy who at this time befriended the little deaf-mutes were Father Jordan, S.J., who, whenever he divided his rewards to the Sunday-school children under his special care, never forgot to set apart a share for the deaf-mutes. Rev. Father Lane of St. Theresa's and Rev. Father O'Reilly of St. John's likewise showed them many kindnesses in their church ministration. In 1883 the classes numbering about 70 girls, were transferred to St. Joseph's Convent, Locust street above Fourth. The boys were placed in charge of the Rev. Fr. Lebreton who taught them at 715 Pine street.

The interest shown in the care of the deaf-mutes by His Grace Archbishop Wood was continued under his beloved successor. The Most Reverend Archbishop Ryan has on several occasions visited the children at St. Joseph's. In 1890 he appointed Rev. Father Broughal of St. Patrick's to act as their Director. On this account the classes began to be held from that time at St. Patrick's Hall, and there also the mutes attended Mass with the children of the parish, until the removal of the State Institution to Mt. Airy in 1892.

From that time the children boys and girls, have assembled at the Church of the Holy Cross, the use of which was kindly given by Rev. J. O'Keefe. Since September, 1895, there being two priests now at Mt. Airy, the mutes have had not only the blessed privilege of assisting at Mass, but Rev. Father Elcock, the new Rector, has every Sunday, as far as possible, given them a special instruction, this being

interpereted in sign language by Mr. Whelan who comes over from the Seminary for this purpose.

Since the opening at Mt. Airy, four Sisters from the Convent at Chestnut Hill teach Christian Doctrine to the classes which now number one hundred and thirty, boys and girls, whose ages range from five to over twenty-two years.

The adult deaf-mutes of the city have formed the "De L'Epée Catholic Deaf-Mute Association," which has a club-room in the Philopatrian Institute, where they meet at regular times, and where they "listen" to lectures in the sign language.

Little as can be done to teach religion in the space of two hours a week,—from 2 to 4 P. M.—even this is something of an improvement on their once neglected condition.

It may not be amiss to say here that, from the time the Sisters of St. Joseph engaged in the work, sixteen years ago, up to the present, that Community has cheerfully defrayed all the expenses attendant on their part of the work, there being no provision, public or private, made for it.

While again bearing witness to the liberality of the State Institution, we cannot but deplore the loss of souls to the Catholic Church. It is impossible in the short time given them on Sunday to give all adequate instruction in even the essentials of Christian Doctrine, and however liberal their educators may be, they cannot but give erroneous ideas of Catholic topics. If some of our Catholic philanthropists would but devote to these afflicted ones of Christ a little of their superfluity, what a harvest of souls might be saved from destruction! Here, sad to say, it is not those "who are not of the fold" that one seeks to bring in; it is souls born to the inheritance of the faith who are, as it were, defrauded of their rights by a misfortune for which they are not accountable. Surely of those whose charity is exerted in their behalf will our Lord say: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto these, ye have done it unto me."

8. In Cincinnati.—The Sisters of Notre Dame have in Cincinnati a school for deaf-mute girls. It was opened in 1890. It has only about fifteen pupils.

Archbishop Elder, like a good shepherd, is concerned for the deaf lambs of his flock. In May, of last year, he addressed a Circular Letter to all the pastors of the diocese, as follows :

"More than once I have expressed my solicitude in regard to the spiritual care of the deaf-mutes in our diocese, both children and adults. We are doing what we can for the children living in Cincinnati. The Sisters of Notre Dame, on Sixth street, have been for several years instructing all whom they could gather, teaching them both by the sign language and by vocal sounds and lip reading. But there are, no doubt, many of the afflicted in other parts of the diocese and probably not a few in Cincinnati who are unknown to us. Natural delicacy disposes both the children and their families rather to conceal their misfortune than to make it known beyond their own immediate circle. Too many, I fear, for want of better opportunity, send their children to public institutions where they are in certain danger of losing their faith. Teaching a deaf-mute to read and write, opens its understanding to an entirely new world. And it is but natural that the person who first awakens it to this new life, should be looked upon as its safe guide and have all its confidence. Whatever idea that first guide may communicate concerning God and the duties to God and the teachings of religion, are seized upon as absolutely true. And experience certainly proves that if these first notions are erroneous, it is humanly impossible to have them effectually corrected. Hence the paramount necessity of having deaf-mutes to receive their very first instructions from persons who have themselves a correct knowledge of religion. How we may effectually provide for this, is a problem yet to be studied. And the first step towards examining this, is to ascertain the number of such afflicted children, where they live, how many of them belong to families with means sufficient to provide for their education, how many must be provided for by the help of charity."

The Archbishop requested the pastors to get the names, etc., of the deaf-mute children within their respective parishes and to send the information to him. He himself conjectured

that the number was about 250. What will be done for them, remains to be seen. But, at present, besides the little school of the Sisters of Notre Dame, a Franciscan Father, the Rev. F. Vincent, gives instructions to the adults of the city as often as his other duties allow.

9. In St. Paul.—The Ladies of the Sacred Heart of Mary, opened in 1886 in St. Paul, Minnesota, St. Mary's Institute for Deaf-Mutes. It has about fifty pupils.

10. In Louisiana.—The Deaf-Mute Institution of the Holy Rosary is situated in one of the healthiest localities of Louisiana, in a pretty rural district called Chinchuba, about thirty miles northeast from New Orleans. This house is the first Catholic institution of its kind in the South, and by its erection a long felt want has been supplied and the hearts of Catholic parents are gladdened as an opportunity is afforded them to give their deaf-mute children a religious education as well as their speaking and hearing children. Very Rev. Canon H. C. Mignot, Rector of the Cathedral at New Orleans, is the founder and director of this institution, which was opened for the admission of deaf and dumb children, on the 1st of October, 1890. The school began with two girls and one boy, but the number steadily increased, and at present fifty-two children, thirty-one boys and twenty-one girls are sheltered under its hospitable roof. Girls of all ages are admitted and boys under the age of fifteen years. Pupils receive board and tuition free of charge. The institution is supported by its founder, the kind and generous hearted Abbé Mignot, aided by the charitably disposed and sympathizing friends of the poor unfortunate mutes, the majority of these being from the poorer class of the people. The children remain here during the ten months of the scholastic year and spend the vacation months, July and August, at home with their parents. The manual and sign methods are used as well as the oral. The institution has a bakery, a carpenter and shoe shop, and printing room, etc., where these industries are studied with success.

The mutes are also instructed in garden and field-work. The total number of pupils instructed since the opening of

the school is 74. The estimated number of deaf-mutes in the Diocese of New Orleans is about 400.

11. In Baltimore.—Maryland has a State school for the Deaf and Dumb, located at Frederick, which was opened about the year 1870. It has upward of 120 pupils. Fifteen years ago, the Rev. Francis Barnum, S. J., then a scholastic, now a brave missionary in Alaska, undertook to visit the Catholic inmates of that institution. Like the Abbé de l' Epée, he began with one pupil, for he had to learn himself before he could teach. As soon as he had attained some proficiency in the sign language, the five Catholic boys, who were in the institution then, went every Sunday to St. John's Church to be instructed by him. Later permission was obtained to visit the children in the school. Shortly afterwards (1882-83) a class for the girls was started, which also consisted of five members. Ever since this last class was formed two catechists from the Novitiate have visited the school on Thursdays to instruct the girls, and on Sundays to instruct the boys. Those who have held the office of catechist, whenever they visited the school, have been treated with the greatest respect, and time and again received much assistance from the Principal, Mr. Charles W. Ely. The work with these children has grown and prospered with the school, so that now four catechists visit it every Sunday. They teach the children the catechism. The hours are so arranged that the Catholic children are receiving their instructions while the other children are attending the Bible lesson in the chapel. For some time past the Catholic children are allowed a certain appointed time during which they can prepare their catechism. The number of Catholic pupils during the last five years has averaged twenty, but, owing to the large graduating class last year, there are only seventeen this year. Five of these have been confirmed, and seven others have received their first Communion; three have made their first Confession, and the others are preparing for the same act. The ages of these pupils range from six years to eighteen.

Those who have made their first Confession approach this sacrament every month, while the older ones receive Com-

munion also. This little mission has on the whole been successful beyond expectation when it is considered that for a teacher of the deaf it is of the utmost importance to be thoroughly acquainted with his pupils, to know their peculiar wants, and above all to have their confidence. This is a difficult matter, in as much as the many duties of the scholasticate limit the time and opportunities of the members upon whom the work of teaching the deaf-mutes devolves. Letters are frequently received by the catechists from graduates, which not seldom bring the good news that their former pupils still remain faithfully attached to the performance of the duties of their religion.

The very Rev. Rector of the Novitiate writes:

"It may be well for you to know that what work is done by us for the deaf is only a side-issue. The main work of the young men here being study, they have very little time to give to active works of zeal. However what time they can spare is given willingly and cheerfully.

"I have one consolation now however in this work and that is, altho' on account of studies they are precluded from spending much time at it just at present—many of them learn, to a certain extent the language, so that in later life very many will be able, at least, to do something for this sadly neglected class of Catholics."

11. A few months ago a correspondent wrote to the San Francisco *Monitor*: "The necessity of Catholic instruction and education is shown by the fact that many of the Catholic children attending the Deaf and Dumb and Blind Institution at Berkeley, rapidly give up their faith altogether, for some reason, after entering the institution. Although it is a State institution, there is some influence which causes the children to neglect their religion. Time was when the children were driven to church in the carriage belonging to the institution, but that has been done away with; consequently the children do not go to church, nor do they receive any instruction to keep alive their faith. Now a Home for deaf-mutes has been established by the Sisters at Temescal. It is unfortunate, however, that the innumerable advantages which years of study and experience and a great income have secured to the Berkeley asylum, should be denied to Catholics who bear their share of taxes for it."

To remedy the forlorn condition of the Catholic deaf-mutes of the Pacific coast, the Sisters of St. Joseph have started a "Catholic Deaf and Dumb College" at Fortieth street and Telegraph avenue, Oakland, California. It is under the patronage of the Archdiocese of San Francisco. It is conducted by Sisters from Carondelet, Missouri, especially trained for the work, and the only Catholic institution of the sort west of the Rocky Mountains.

12. In Boston.—Massachusetts has no Catholic school for deaf-mutes, although Chancellor Nagle says: "A corporation has been formed for the purpose of establishing an asylum for the deaf and dumb, but the institution is not yet in operation." The State itself has no school for them, but the Protestants have the New England Industrial School for Deaf-Mutes at Beverly, some of the pupils of which are or ought to be Catholics.

To sum up, therefore: for the Catholic deaf-mutes in the United States, who now number between 8,000 and 10,000, we have one priest who devotes to some fifty of them his whole time, three other priests who give regular instructions at weekly intervals, no Brotherhood, members of four Sisterhoods—the Sisters of St. Joseph, the Ladies of the Sacred Heart of Mary, the Sisters of St. Francis, and the Sisters of Notre Dame—and seven young men—five clerics and two lay—who teach in three Sunday schools.

The Ladies of the Sacred Heart of Mary offer to establish at least one school for the deaf and dumb in every State or in every ecclesiastical province in the Union, and to conduct it without pay. If any bishop does not desire to introduce their Sisterhood into his diocese, they agree to train, free of charge, a limited number of members of other communities for this special work.

With this multitude of from eight to ten thousand to care for, with the very limited provision made for their religious instruction, and with the offer of this Sisterhood to conduct more institutions, the problem is—Can nothing further be done for this generation of the deaf and dumb?

Hanoverville, Md. L. W. REILLY.

PREPARATORY SEMINARIES FOR CLERICAL STUDENTS.

(SECOND ARTICLE ON "CLERICAL EDUCATION").

THE legislation of the Council of Trent has, in the course of years, shown wonderful vitality and unmistakable signs of the special assistance of God the Holy Ghost. Considering the evils which it was called upon to extirpate and the heresies it had to grapple with, it was very necessary indeed. Its enactments have stood the test of three centuries and are to this day a vital and most important part of the Canon Law of the Catholic Church.

From a rapid sketch of the situation into which the clergy had drifted, we have learned how very important immediate legislation for ecclesiastical education had become. Add to this that the universities, which have supplied up to this day most eminent prelates of the Church, were being rapidly infected with the new ideas spread broadcast by the innovators who thus hoped to vindicate their zeal for science and reason; thus vocations to the priesthood had gradually disappeared in these centres of secular and religious learning. It is a matter of record that, for nearly twenty years, not a single graduate of the University of Vienna had taken Orders; Cologne had just elected a new regent for its Catholic University who was found to favor the so-called reformers; the University of Dilligen, founded in Germany for the express purpose of combating the erroneous doctrines of Protestantism, could not find enough able priests to fill its most necessary chairs. France and the Netherlands had reason to suspect the doctrines of some of their most illustrious representatives of their seats of learning. Hence the necessity of providing schools where the pure Catholic doctrine might be taught without the dangerous leaven of error.

Soundness of doctrine, a certain amount of seclusion, so as to withdraw the young candidates for the priesthood from the danger to their faith and from the corrupting influences of worldly ambition and pleasure, became therefore the keynote of Seminary legislation. The youth destined for the

Church were to be trained for the service of the sanctuary under the very eye of the Bishop.

Hence we find the famous Archbishop of Braza, Dom Bartholomew of the Martyrs, emulating the zeal of his holy friend the Cardinal of Milan, and establishing his seminary within six months after his return from the Council of Trent. "He selected himself, out of all the youth of his diocese, those who appeared to him the most likely to be good and pious, and set over them professors whose charity and prudence equaled their ability. And he ordered them to watch over the habits and morals of the boys more carefully than over their studies, saying that science and cleverness, without piety and virtue, would be useless for his purpose, which was to train students for the service of God and the good of souls, and not men who looked upon Holy Orders as a means of raising themselves in station in order to satisfy their pride, a detestible abuse from which his diocese had already suffered too much."[1]

The Trentan Decrees regulating clerical education are still in force and are the pattern of discipline in every Catholic diocese of the world which can command financial means for the support of a seminary. But these decrees are not like the laws of the Persians and Medes. Being disciplinary laws they are subject to the necessary changes of time and place somewhat infringing upon the letter of the law, in order to enable the Church to better maintain its spirit.

We have already seen that the seminaries, the establishment of which was ordered by the Council, were for the education of all clerics from twelve years of age up to the day they were sufficiently educated to be elevated to the priesthood. The first change for the better, sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority, was the separation of the younger boys, say from twelve to eighteen, pursuing their classical studies, from the older and more advanced clerics. Hence the founding of *petit* or preparatory seminaries, so called to distinguish them from the *grand* or theological seminaries

1 Life of Dom Bartholomew of the Martyrs, by Lewis da Granada, translated by Lady Herbert.

wherein the young men of mature years enter upon the study of the nobler sciences of philosophy and theology. As early as 1567, St. Charles, the guiding spirit of the Council of Trent, saw the necessity of such separation and acted upon it in the metropolitan city of Milan of which he was the Archbishop. He first established a great seminary of most magnificent proportions, endowed it with a princely revenue and personally superintended its government. He visited it frequently, assisted at the public examinations, gave to its inmates conferences full of the fire of divine love wherewith his soul was consumed, and assiduously exhorted them to acquire that zeal for the salvation of souls which was the only object of their ecclesiastical vocation. The higher studies being pursued in it, he established another great seminary, called *La Canonica*, for the training of those who took the simple course of moral theology and were immediately needed for the work of the ministry. These two seminaries not supplying a sufficient number of priests for the many parishes of his immense diocese, he established outside of the city of Milan three colleges for clerics, which were in time to become the feeders of the larger seminaries, and in which the youths intended for the ecclesiastical state were instructed in grammar and rhetoric and in the ministry of the lower clerical functions. By this wise step, St. Charles Borromeo, grafted the improved methods of the Council of Trent upon the ancient discipline of the Church, which as early as the sixth century had established *rural* or sacerdotal schools near the country churches under the direction of priests, and episcopal or *Cathedral* schools near the city residences of the Bishops. Among the latter institutions those of Poitiers, Treves, and Tours were celebrated for the learning of their professors and the efficiency of their numerous scholars.

The example of the great churchman was eagerly followed by his contemporaries. The separation of the preparatory from the theological seminary became henceforth the rule in all well regulated dioceses as soon as their income justified the Bishop in taking this wise and laudable step.

These seminaries had, from the very nature of the reasons

which had caused the Trentan legislation, far more of the character of cloisters than of colleges. The young men trained in them never left the precincts of the institution—if we except the vacation time usually spent in a country annex or villa—from the day on which they took the momentous first step in their ecclesiastical vocation, at the tender age of twelve, until the Bishop ordained them priests of God, and sent them forth into the world to preach the Gospel and to labor for the salvation of souls. The same spirit which called these boarding schools into being is still ruling to a great extent in the ecclesiastical seminaries of Italy and other southern countries. This system of total retirement from the world bore magnificent fruits: to it the Church is indebted for those giants of intellect and those models of pastoral vigilance, the names of whom adorn the ecclesiastical annals of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. But it may also be candidly admitted that the system offered serious drawbacks to efficiency, inasmuch as it tended to estrange the inferior clergy somewhat from the people, and thus lessened its influence over the homes and daily lives of the individual members of the flock. The sad results of this separation grew apace in the course of a hundred years; and those who know the religious situation of France and Italy will readily understand that the times we live in and the nature of the missionary and reform work expected of the priest to-day, necessitate a change of discipline which we deem advantageous to a solid ecclesiastical training.

Whilst there are times when, in order to rule the world, you must retire from it; there are also times when one must live in the world to exert a great influence over it.

To-day, the priest who is anxious to do good and to exert a salutary influence over his own people as well as over non-Catholics must live in the world, though he may not be of it. This is especially true of our own country. Pius IX is said to have expressed his conviction that there is more merit in being a good secular priest in America than to be a religious, and the fact that those religious who are nearest to the people are the ones who do the most good seems to confirm the papal

dictum. Doing good to others is a greater source of merit and a greater safeguard to virtue in the world than the state which makes the ministry of the Word subservient to personal sanctification. Not that the latter ought to be neglected ; far from it. Indeed our religious clergy have grafted upon their respective Orders in America the duties of the American secular priest, as the only means of reaching the people and working efficaciously for the salvation of souls. Will the young man who from his tenderest years has been kept entirely away from the world, who has never known its temptations, has never had occasion to test the solidity of his virtue by a temporary sojourn at home—will he do effective work under the modern conditions in which his life is cast, and will he protect himself as effectively as he should against its tendencies and its baneful influences? We doubt it.

There is no question here of keeping the clerical student away from Church influences ; no desire to have young men destined for the Church exposed before their time to the temptations of a world which might allure them away from their vocation before they are mature enough to be able to resist. We are seeking the best conditions of education which will fit the young ecclesiastic for the active life which he has to lead in this country, and to enable him readily to withstand the alurements of a life of ease, the danger of which to priestly sanctity can only be avoided by the one who is aware of it. We plead, therefore, for less seclusion from the world than that which obtained in the preparatory seminary of olden times, with the understanding that the temporary commerce with the world, to which the young student is exposed, be carefully guarded and well ordered.

A virtuous home life during which the young man keeps aloof from worldly amusements, learning to do so from his own free will without fear or constraint, is, in our opinion, the best preparation for a thorough, solid ecclesiastical vocation. Hence we advocate the Catholic college day-school where it can be had, provided always that the home is such as not to be a drawback to vocation. Country boys must

necessarily avail themselves of the boarding school, and so must city boys whose home surroundings would force them too much into society, bring them too much in contact with worldly amusements or exert a weakening influence upon their piety and retard the growth of a serious and unselfish character. But even students so situated are not denied the advantages of training which we advocate for the family circle, since they avail themselves twice a year of the vacation, which is long enough to test their resolution and their moral strength. We do not believe in keeping young men away from their homes for an uninterrupted period of years; we contend that it is not healthy either for the mind, heart or body. Too often a negative virtue, very fervent and admirable when protected by the safeguards of constant supervision and by the absence of temptation, will become a positive danger when confronted, unsupported, with the world-life which sooner or later the priest has to face. But for the more advanced students of the Ecclesiastical Seminary we would insist that they spend their two years philosophy in the boarding school of the seminary. At this stage of his studies we must assume that the young man's character is already in a measure formed. Two years spent away from home will test his endurance in being deprived of family enjoyment, whilst teaching him the merit of self-denial, a virtue more necessary to the priest than even to the monk, and far more difficult of observance in the world than in the cloister. For it is never to be forgotten that sacrifice is the essential condition of the secular priest's life, the kernel of an ecclesiastical vocation.

With regard to Catholic Colleges, we think it wisely provided that there are more mixed colleges[1] than preparatory seminaries properly so-called. The latter no doubt are necessary, and the fact that their superiors insist on the students spending their vacations away from them makes away with

1 By *mixed colleges* we mean colleges the classical course of which is followed by all students who aim at a liberal education, and attendance at which does not necessarily imply an ecclesiastical vocation, but includes the ordinary preparation for studies in law, medicine, and even business.

whatever objection we might raise against them from the point of view just developed. Besides, they secure many excellent vocations which might be lost in more secular institutions. But the existence of mixed colleges is a blessing to the Church. The vocations which have matured in the latter always act in the seminary as an additional safeguard and incentive to those of the former, whilst the more acentuated ecclesiastical training of the students educated in the preparatory seminary exerts a beneficial influence upon the students coming from mixed colleges. True, some vocations are lost in them, but as a rule they are weak ones. Many advantages counterbalance the disadvantages which may be found in the mixed colleges. The ecclesiastical vocations therein are apt to be more solid because they represent, so to say, the survival of the fittest, they come out of the fight of contradiction. The youths educated in them are better able to cope with the world, the dangers of which they know better although they should not have experienced its vices. Their experience at second hand is most valuable to them. Professors of such colleges, if they understand their mission and do their duty, know how to enliven their lessons with admonitions and counsel to prepare the majority of the pupils for the good fight in the world. Thus, the students whose ecclesiastical vocation develops and matures there, are all the better informed and equipped to be leaders in that fight. Again, they form life-long friendships with companions who are to crowd every walk of life, the commercial and the scientific, the legal and the medical professions; and their priestly influence among the people is all the greater from the fact that they are on terms of friendship with the foremost citizens, the brightest and most respected men of the community in which they live.

It may be objected that this is world-wisdom, that the sacred character of the priesthood ought to be all sufficient to command the respect of the Catholic community for its pastor. But let us not forget that the good will of the whole community is a ministerial help not to be despised. Let us not forget that social conditions must, of necessity, govern

every community; its every member is influenced by position and social standing, and that the priest who makes all earthly things available to bring about the salvation of souls, is best seconding the designs of Providence.

But our partiality for mixed colleges does not extend to institutions having the collegiate and theological course in the same building. Seminarians ought to live under a discipline of far greater elasticity than that which can be admitted by the constraint necessarily put upon college boys. Where both are together, the younger students will be apt to resent the seeming severity exercised toward them, and fret under it; nor will the separation of grades remedy the apparently partial system of discipline. Spiritual exercises, public reading, free days, company keeping, etc., are all items which suggest necessary distinctions, the details of which must not delay us. We deem a change of school, such as is implied in the transition from the college to the seminary, a very desirable factor to impress upon the mind of the ecclesiastical student the sublimity of the sacred calling to which he aspires. To remain in the same college with only a change of class-room, even if it implies the donning of the cassock, is not enough of an event for this most important and decisive step of his youthful life. Let the entrance day upon strict seminary life be to the clerical student what the entering into the monastery and the taking of the religious habit means to the religious; not a matter-of-course promotion from one division to another. Then again, it is better for the theological student to be on less hail-fellow-well-met terms with those of the undergraduate course; too often, familiarity breeds contempt. Say you: the objection holds good for mixed colleges? Not at all! They who have ecclesiastical vocations graduate from the college to enter upon a four or five years' seminary course, and that withdrawal to a higher school of learning secures the respect of their former associates without loss of their confidence and friendship. Nor should the fact that in such seminaries the theological students have a chance to teach the classical branches dispose us to favor the system of one house for both departments.

On the contrary, we find that our candidates for the priesthood have no time to spare for teaching collegians, and that the four years' course is all too short and too well filled with necessary study to allow extra duties, which imply needed preparation, to the detriment of the study of their theological branches. We fancy, moreover, that where professors have to do all the teaching, the mixing of classical and theological classes is felt as an unbecoming strain upon their faculties, and not very conducive to a professor's thoroughness and efficiency.

Speaking of teachers, we venture to offer *en passant*, to professors of preparatory seminaries and colleges, a suggestion which experience has taught us to deem very important for the future work of the priest. It is well to have a five minutes' recitation from memory at the beginning of every morning and every afternoon class, and not to confine one's selection of matter to Latin or even English classics. In these United States, controversy has made the textual correctness of Bible quotations of primary importance. As a rule, theological students dealing with Scripture and dogma in the Latin tongue, readily remember the Latin text which stands them in good stead when preaching in any language but the English, as custom with foreigners, permits a free translation. But in an English sermon, priests are expected, indeed obliged, to cite the Sacred Word textually. To supply facility of expression to the future preacher and give him the incalculable benefit of a ready memory recalling Scripture texts adapted to his subject, the teacher will find it useful to make the student of the classical course memorize every day a few select verses of the New Testament, especially of the Gospels and of the Epistles of St. Paul. The text learned in boyhood will ever cling to the mind with a distinctive correctness which surprises us as we grow older, and makes the recitation of a classical passage memorized thirty or forty years ago an ever recurring delight. To be able to recall, instead of the threadbare beauties of old pagan literature, the inspired words of Jesus Christ, with faultless accuracy in his pleadings for truth and virtue, will be of

incalculable benefit to the priest and of the greatest profit to his hearers.

CAMILLUS P. MAES,
Bishop of Covington.

(*To be continued.*)

THE UNION OF THE CHURCHES.

XV.

THE Roman Church is quite willing that the Oriental Churches should retain their liturgies and their traditional customs; nay, she protects and safeguards such of them as are commendable, whilst she tolerates those which have something objectionable, so long as they do not prejudice the purity of doctrine or the sanctity of morals: *In una fide nihil officit sanctae Ecclesiae consuetudo diversa.* Thus did Gregory the Great[1] write in the sixth century, and in the same spirit, as we saw in preceding paragraphs, does Leo XIII write:[2] *Vera Christi Ecclesia, sicut magnopere studet ea custodire inviolata quae, utpote divina, immutabilia accepit, ita in usurpandis eorum formis nonnunquam concedit novi aliquid vel indulget, in iis praesertim quaecum venerabili antiquitate conveniant.*

The Patriarch does not, however, seem to be animated by a like spirit. Persuaded that outside his Constantinopolitan Church of the "first seven ecumenical Councils" nothing good or right can be found, he views with suspicion the different rites and certain historical customs of the Church of Rome, and since he does not find them conformable to those used in his patriarchate before the ninth century, he brands them without further thought as *anti-evangelical innovations.* One of these traditions of Rome, condemned by him, is that of using *unleavened bread* in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist. It may be well to state this accusa-

1 Epistola ad Leandrum, l, I, 43, Migne, P. L. vol. 77, p. 497.
2 Litt. Apost., *Orientalium dignitas*, Nov. 30, 1894.

tion, also, in the very terms which the Patriarch uses in his *Encyclical.* As we read them it appears to us that he had before him the writings of some old compiler of a thousand years ago, who withal shows himself but meagerly conversant with the ecclesiastical affairs of his own times.

The accusation of the Patriarch, copied from the letter of Michael Cerularius written in 1053 to John, Bishop of Trani,[1] is couched in the following terms: "The one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church of the seven ecumenical Councils, *following the example of our Divine Saviour*, celebrated the Holy Eucharist *for more than a thousand years*, in the East and West, with leavened bread, as also the Papal theologians, who are lovers of truth, know; but the Papal Church from the eleventh century has made innovations and introduced *unleavened* bread in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist."[2]

A few observations will suffice to show the futility of this accusation. In the first place the Patriarch assumes, as proved and unquestioned, that Christ our Lord in instituting the Holy Eucharist made use of *leavened bread.* Now this is a statement for which we have not only no proof, much less is it undoubted, but it appears rather that the very opposite is proved and undoubted. According to the testimony of the Evangelists (Math. xxvi, 17; Mark xiv, 12; Luke xxii, 7), Christ instituted the Holy Eucharist *on the first day of the unleavened bread*, τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἀζύμων, that is, at a time when the Jews were strictly forbidden to use leavened bread. "Septem diebus *azyma* comedetis; *in die primo non erit fermentum* in domibus vestris; quicumque comederit fermentum, peribit anima illa de Israel,

1 *Epistola ad Joannem Tranensem in Apuli a Episc.* Migne, P. L. vol. 143, pp. 793–798.

2 Ἡ μία ἁγία, καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ Ἐκκλησία τῶν ἑπτὰ Οἰκουμενικῶν, Συνόδων κατά τό παράδειγμα τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐτέλει τήν θείαν εὐχαριστίαν ἐπὶ πλέον τῶν χιλίων ετῶν κατά τε τὴν Ἀνατολὴν καὶ τὴν Λύσιν δι' ἐνζύμου ἄρτου ὡς μαρτυροῦσι καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ φιλαλήθεις ἐκ τῶυ παπικῶν θεολογων· ἀλλ' ἡ παπικὴ Ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑνδεκάτου αἰῶνος ἐκαινοτόμησε καὶ ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τῆς θ. Εὐχαριστίας εἰσαγαγοῦσα τὰ ἄζυμα. *Litterae Encyclicae.* §. 9.

a primo die, usque ad septimum."[1] The writer of the patriarchal *Encyclical*, copying and repeating the gratuitous assertion of Cerularius, passed over and ignored the refutation of it made in 1054 by Leo IX, who wrote thus to Cerularius: "Qui non venerat solvere legem sed adimplere, juxta ipsius legis praeceptum, ex azymis et vino vetus pascha adimplevit, et protinus ex azymis et vino novum pascha, sicut aperte Lucas narrat, discipulis tradidit. . . . Quod si in Coena Domini Jesu fermentatum apparuisset, aut ipse seu discipuli eius quoquo modo gustassent, juste sicut praevaricatores legis perirent, nec ipse Dominus diceret suis insidiatoribus: *Quis ex vobis arguet me de peccato?* Nec esset opus falsos testes ad perdendum eum quaerere, cum hoc solo perderetur iuste."[2]

Let it not be argued that, according to the opinion of some writers, Christ anticipated the celebration of the Pasch one day, for even if this be admitted, logically speaking, it would follow only that Christ *could have* made use of leavened bread, not that he *de facto* did make use of it.[3] For it is clear that even if He had anticipated the day, it was but natural that Christ would celebrate the Pasch with His disciples by observing the rite prescribed by the law and using unleavened bread rather than the leavened. Therefore, not not even according to this opinion, whatever may be its value,[4] could the Patriarch appeal *with certitude* to the example of our Divine Saviour, against ihe Church of Rome.

XVI.

Cerularius, who completed the Oriental schism, reproached the Latins *of the eleventh century* because "they shaved the

1 Exodi xii, 15.

2 *Ep. ad Michael Cer.* Migne, P. L. vol. 143, p. 775.

3 See Estius. In lib. IV Sent., dist. 8, § 8; De Augustinis, *De Re Sacramentaria* P. 2, Art. 2; Hurter, *Theologia Specialis*, P. 2, vol. 3, trac. IX. n. 483.

4 A full and learned refutation of this theory has been written by Knabenbauer, *Cursus Scripturae Sacrae, Comment. in Evang. secundum Matthaeum*, Paris, Lethielleux, 1893, vol. 2, pp. 405–424.

beard, abstained on Saturdays and used unleavened bread in the Consecration."[1] This statement seems to have been sufficient authority in the eyes of the Patriarch to assert that the Church of Rome *for more than a thousand years* consecrated with leavened bread, and that she in the eleventh century introduced unleavened bread in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist! The accusation of Cerularius is cited in the letter of 1053 to which, as we have said, Pope Leo IX made reply in January 1054. The introduction, therefore, of unleavened bread, during the eleventh century, must have been made some years after the year 1000, but prior to 1053, since in that year the use of unleavened bread, according to to the testimony of Cerularius[2] was already *common* in the West. How, therefore, the churches of Italy, Gaul, Spain, England and Germany, after having consecrated, as the the Patriarch says, *for more than a thousand years* with leavened bread, in the short space of a few years conspired to use unleavened bread, without our being able to indicate a decree, or motive, or incident which might have caused such a change, is a problem, the solution of which we should seek in vain from the Patriarch.

It is an historical fact that the use of unleavened bread was *not* introduced into the West in the eleventh century, and that as it was common in the Latin Church at that epoch, so it had been used *ab immemorabili* in preceding centuries. Here are a few apodictic proofs. Dominic, Patriarch of Grado and of Aquileja, a contemporary of Cerularius, wrote thus in 1050 to the Patriarch of Antioch: "Nos paternitati vestrae tacere non possumus, quod a clero Constantinopolitano sanctam Romanam Ecclesiam vituperari audivimus. Reprehendunt igitur sacratissima azyma, quae in Corpore Christi sanctificamus et sumimus. . . . Ubi nos unitatem catholicae Ecclesiae servare, sine quolibet schismate, cupien-

1 "Latini azymo pane in sacrificio utuntur, sabbato ieiunant, barbam radunt." *Epist. ad Petrum Antiochenum.* Migne P. L. vol. 143, p. 557.

2 *Epistola ad Joannem Tran.* n. 1. Ibid. p. 929.

tes, maxime *azymorum consuetudinem, non solum apostolica sed etiam ipsam et Domini retinemus traditione.*[1]

Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mayence, at the beginning of the ninth century, consequently more than two centuries before Cerularius, treating of the rites to be used in the Sacrifice of the Mass, speaks of unleavened bread, which, he says, *in sacramentum corporis Christi sanctificari oportet*, and he declares that "Istum ordinem ab Apostolis et Apostolicis viris traditum Romana tenet Ecclesia *et per totum pene occidentem omnes Ecclesiae eamdem traditionem servant.*"[2] The same is attested by Alcuin in the eighth century. He says: "Audivimus aliquos in illis partibus (Hispaniae) affirmare salem esse in sacrificium corporis Christi mittendum. Quam consuetudinem nec universalis observat Ecclesia nec Romana custodit auctoritas. Tria sunt quae in sacrificio huius testimonii offerenda sunt, panis, aqua et vinum. . . . *Panis*, qui in Christi corpus consecratur *absque fermento* ullius alterius infectionis debet esse mundissimus.[3]

We shall not add any comment to these testimonies since they clearly prove the historical falsity of the two assertions of the Patriarch, that is, that the Latins for more than a thousand years used leavened bread, and that in the eleventh century the use of unleavened bread was introduced into the West.[4]

But we wish to note another grave historical inaccuracy of

1 *Epist. Dominici Patriarchae Venetiarum*, n. 3, Migne P. G. vol. 120, p. 754.

2 *De Clericorum Institutione*, lib. I, cap. 31. Migne, P. L. vol. 107, pp. 318 and 324.

3 *Epist. ad Lugdunenses*, 90. Migne, P. L. vol. 100, p. 289.

4 For other proofs consult *the Papal Theologians friends of truth:* Umberto di Selva Candida; *Adv. Graecorum calumnias*, Migne, P. L. vol. 143, p. 931; Mabillon, *De Pane Eucharistico Vetera Analecta.* Edit. Montalant. Paris, 1723, p. 525; Bona. *Rer. Liturg.*, l. I, c. 23, Antverpiae, 1739, pp. 262, etc. Hergenröther, *Photius, Patriarch von Constantinopel.* Regensburg, 1869, vol. 3, p. 787, and the *Kirchenlexikon* of Freiburg, Article on the *Azimes*, Nilles, *Kalendarium manuale utriusque Ecclesiae*, t. II, c. 1. § 2. Oeniponte, 1881, pp. 221-229.

the illustrious Patriarch with regard to the use of leavened bread in the East. For it is historically false to say that for more than one thousand years leavened bread was always and everywhere used in the Churches of the East. Bickell[1] and Thalhofer[2] find an undoubted proof of the use of unleavened bread, at least in the provinces of Osrhoenia and of Euphratesia, in the letter which Rabula of Edessa wrote in the fifth century to Gemellino, Bishop of Perra. In it Rabula expressly attests that *Sacramentum corporis Christi azymo repraesentatur.* Whatsoever may be said of this document[3] it is certain that the use of unleavened bread was known very well and is very ancient among the Maronites and Armenians. We read in the Acts of the Synod of the Maronites of Mount Libanus.[4] *Qui mos et in Ecclesia nostra et apud Armenos quoque in Oriente, ab immemorabili tempore obtinuit, et authentica etiam huius rei documenta proferre possumus.* Nor are indications wanting of the use of unleavened bread in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist in the first century of the Church. Philo, the historian, describing, as Eusebius, Jerome and Epiphanius attest,[5] the customs of the primitive Christians of Alexandria, mentions their suppers and two species of bread, leavened and unleavened; and he affirms that the *unleavened bread* was preserved in the *portico of the holy table,*[6] ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ προνάῳ ἱερᾶς τραπέζης.... ἄζυμοι μὲν οἱ ἄρτοι, κ. τ. λ.

1 *Ansgewählte Schriften der Syrischen Kirchenväter*, Kempten, 1874, p. 251.

2 *Handbuch der Katholischen Liturgik*, Freiburg, 1890, vol. II, p. 137.

3 See the *Revue de l'Eglise grecque unie.* 1888, p. 188: Hurter, *Theologia Specialis*, Ed. VII, Oeniponte, 1891, P. II, p. 378.

4 *Collectio Conc. Lacensis*, vol. II, p. 180: Benedict XIV, *Bullarium*, Const. XLVII, *Allatae nobis*, n. 23, Prati, 1867, vol. III, P, II, p. 258.

5 See Giampetro Secchi, *La Cattedra Alessandrina*, Venezia, 1853, p. 142.

6 In the edition of the works of *Philo* made by *Gelenius* at Frankfurt, 1691, the text is given in the *Treatise on the Contemplative Life*, p. 902. In the edition before us is also found an introduction by Photius in which he relates that Philo knew St. Peter and "makes mention of and praises the disciples of St. Mark" in the Church of Alexandria.

He is not mistaken when he thinks that this fact finds a counterpart in the words of St. Paul to the Corinthians: "Epulemur, non in fermento veteri, neque in fermento malitiae et nequitiae; sed in azymis sinceritatis et veritatis.[1]

Thus going back from century to century even to the beginning of Christianity, we find in the use of both kinds of bread the full justification of the doctrine of the Church defined with the consent of the Latins and Greeks in the Council of Florence,[2] that is, that the Body of Christ can be truly consecrated both in unleavened and leavened bread; and that priests are to consecrate it in the one or the other according to the rite of their Church, be it the Eastern or the Western.

Pope Gregory VII had already in 1080 declared: "Graeci suum fermentum commendantes, reprehensionis in nos levissima verba contumaciter iaculari non desinunt. *Nos vero azymum nostrum inexpugnabili secundum Dominum ratione defendentes, ipsorum fermentum nec vituperamus nec reprobamus.*"[3]

Let us conclude this paragraph by citing the beautiful words which Leo Allatius ascribes to the monk Hilarion: "Et haec scripsi vobis, Graeci amicissimi, non panem vestrum, quem adorans aeque ac nostra azyma revereor, incusans; sed exponens, *neque probe, neque ut Christianum addecet*, vos gerere, dum Latinorum azyma dicto factoque laeditis, iniuriaque afficitis."[4]

XVII.

Another *anti-evangelical innovation*, of which the Patriarch accuses the Church of Rome, refers to the *consecration* of the Eucharist. The accusation is very grave, since, if it were true, we should have to say that the Church of Rome, since the ninth century, did not have the Sacrifice of the Mass nor the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

1 I. Corinthians, V. 8.

2 *Decretum unionis*, Denziger, *Enchiridion*, p. 158.

3 Migne, P. 4, vol. 148, p. 579.

4 *Graecia Orthodoxa*, Romae, Edit. Propag., 1656, Tom. I, p. 762.

The Patriarch declares that "the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church of the seven ecumenical Councils (that is, *of the first nine centuries*), admitted that the sacred oblation is consecrated *after* the prayer of the invocation of the Holy Spirit, by means of the blessing of the priest, as the ancient sacramentaries of Rome and Gaul give testimony. Later, the Papal Church made an innovation by admitting arbitrarily that the consecration of the sacred oblation takes place at the moment when the words of Our Lord are pronounced: *Accipite et comedite: hoc est Corpus meum*, and *Bibite ex hoc omnes: Hic est enim sanguis meus.*[1]

By a singular antithesis frequently to be remarked in the writings of those who undertake to attack the Church of Rome, the illustrious Patriarch manages, by this accusation, to defeat his own argument. Whilst apparently fulminating an anathema against the Pontiff and the Church of Rome, he actually anathematizes himself and his Church. For *who* indeed has brought about an innovation in this important matter? Was it the Western or the protesting Eastern Church? That the consecration of the Sacred Species is effected *by the words of Christ* pronounced by the priest, and not by the invocation of the Holy Spirit, which in *some* liturgies follows the words of consecration, is a doctrine strictly catholic and conformable to the Gospel narrative regarding the institution of the Holy Eucharist.

In the history of this institution which the Evangelists[2] and St. Paul[3] have left us, not a word is found about an invocation of the Holy Spirit, or that Christ demanded to be

1 *Ἡ μία ἁγία, καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ Ἐκκλησία τῶν ἑπτὰ Οἰκουμενικῶν Συνόδων παρεδέχετο, ὅτι τὰ τίμια δῶρα καθαγιάζονται μετὰ τὴν εὐχὴν τῆς ἐπικλήσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος διὰ τῆς εὐλογίας τοῦ ἱερέως, ὡς μαρτυροῦσι τὰ ἀρχαῖα τυπικὰ τῆς Ρώμης καὶ τῶν Γαλλιῶν, ὕστερον ὅμως ἐκαινοτόμησε καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἡ παπικὴ Ἐκκλησία, ἀποδεξαμένη αὐθαιρέτως τὴν καθαγίασιν τῶν τιμίων δώρων γινομένην σὺν τῇ ἐκφωνήσει τῶν Κυριακῶν λογίων: "Λάβετε φάγετε. τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου." καὶ "Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. τοῦτο γάα ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου."*—*Litterae Encyclicae*, § 10.

2 Matth. xxvi, 26–29; Mark xiv, 22–25; Luke xxii, 14–20.

3 1 Cor. xi, 23–25.

used or used such in the institution of the Sacrament of His Body and most precious Blood. On the contrary, the entire account plainly attests that Christ caused His Body and Blood to be present under the species of bread and wine solely by the words cited by the sacred writers, words which literally signify their actual presence. If it were otherwise, we should be obliged to say that these writers inspired by God, wishing to narrate to us, and in fact narrating to us with so many particulars the institution of the Eucharist, neglected to mention the most important part of it, which, without doubt, the invocation of the Holy Spirit would be, if from it, as the Patriarch pretends, the consecration of the sacred gifts depended.

And that the consecration is effected *solely by the words of Christ* pronounced by the priest, is likewise a very old and constant opinion held by the Fathers of the Church. Thus taught *among the Greeks*, Justin, Irenæus, Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom, John Damascene; *among the Syrians*, James of Saruga, Isaac the Great, Maruta; *among the Latins*, Ambrose, Augustine, Isidore, and all who from the beginning of the Church wrote on this subject.[1] We shall quote as examples the testimonies of two very ancient and eminent Doctors of the Church. St. Ambrose, explaining the Gospel text which relates to the consecration, says: "Qui (Christus) pridie quam pateretur, in sanctis manibus suis accepit panem. Antequam consecretur, panis est; ubi autem *verba Christi accesserint*, corpus est Christi . . . Et *ante verba Christi* calix est vini et aquae plenus: ubi *verba Christi operata fuerint*, ibi sanguis Christi efficitur, qui plebem redemit."[2]

1 The exact quotations of the Fathers are found in the work of Cardinal Franzelin *De SS. Eucharistiae Sacramento et Sacrificio*, Rome, 1868, pp. 70–78. His Eminence establishes and in a masterly manner develops the following thesis: "Quae in orientalibus et aliquot occidentalibus liturgiis post verba consecratoria occurrunt Spiritus Sancti invocationes super dona proposita, non pertinent ad corporis Christi praesentiam vel efficiendam vel impetrandam . . . sed ad effectae iam realis praesentiae declarationem et ad fructus salutaris in corpore Christi morali, quod est Ecclesia, imploratorem."

2 *De Sacramentis* l. IV, c. 5, nn. 22, 23. Migne, P. L. vol. 16, p. 444.

St. John Chrysostom repeats the same: "Non enim homo est, qui facit ut proposita efficiantur corpus et sanguis Christi: sed ipse Christus qui pro nobis crucifixus est. Figuram implens stat Sacerdos verba proferens, virtus autem et gratia est Dei. *Hoc est corpus meum*, inquit *Hoc verbum transformat ea quae proposita sunt.*

Florus of Lyons, well versed in ecclesiastical learning, in his work *De Expositione Missae*, written about 840, after examining all the liturgies, explains that of Rome, taking the words of the Canon—*Qui pridie quam pateretur* down to *in mei memoriam facietis:* "In his verbis, sine quibus nulla lingua, nulla regio, nulla civitas, id est nulla pars Ecclesiae catholicae conficere potest, id est consecrare sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Domini, ipse Dominus tradidit Apostolis, unde universalis Ecclesia iugem memoriam sui Redemptoris celebret, et Apostoli generaliter omni Ecclesiae. *Christi ergo virtute et verbis semper consecratur et consecrabitur.*[2]

XVIII.

After all it will hardly be necessary for us to refute the *dogmatic error* which the Patriarch presents to us as the unadulterated doctrine of his so-called "orthodox" Church. The Greeks themselves, predecessors of the Patriarch in the government of the Eastern Churches, have many times confuted and solemnly rejected it. Thus, at the Council of Florence, the Greek Fathers declared in a document, drawn up by a notary, that with regard to the consecration of the Eucharist the Churches which they represented believed the same as the Roman Church, and they rejected the doctrine of Nicholas Cabasila, which is precisely the one advocated by the present Patriarch. It may be well to reproduce this document:

1 τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα μεταῤῥυθμίζει τὰ προκείμενα. *De proditione Judae*, Hom. I, nn. 5, 6. Migne, P. G. vol. 48, p. 380.

2 *De Expositione Missae*, n. 60. Migne, P. L. vol. 119, p. 52.

"On Sunday, July 5, 1438, in the general congregation, presided over by our Most Holy Lord, Eugene IV by divine Providence Pope, the Most Reverend Fathers and Lords of the Holy Roman Church, Cardinals, Patriarchs, Archbishops, Abbots, Doctors and Masters both Latin and Greek, being present, the Reverend Father and Lord the Archbishop of Nicaea, in his own name and in the name of the other Fathers representing the Eastern Churches, publicly in a loud and intelligible voice, made use of these words or similar ones of the same import:—Most Holy Father and You Most Reverend Fathers and Lords here present: In the preceding meetings, there arose, among other differences between us, a doubt concerning the consecration of the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, and *some have suspected that we and our Church do not believe that that most precious Sacrament is effected by the words of the Saviour Our Lord Jesus Christ;* for this reason we have come here in the presence of Your Holiness and of all the others here present who are of the Holy Roman Church, to give assurance to Your Holiness and the other Fathers and Lords here present concerning this doubt and we say briefly: . . . *We have heard from all the Holy Doctors of the Church, and especially from the most blessed John Chrysostom, who is best known to us, that the words of the Lord are those which change and transsubstantiate the bread and the wine into the true Body and Blood of Christ; and that those divine words of the Saviour have all the virtue to operate this transsubstantiation; hence, we of necessity follow that same most holy Doctor and his opinion.*"[1]

The assertion, therefore, of the Patriarch and of the twelve Bishops who with him signed the *Encyclical Letter* of Constantinople against the Pope of Rome, stands plainly contradicted by Greek Bishops, their own predecessors. More recently it was also refuted by the "orthodox"

1 The autograph of this version, signed by *Arnold, notary, etc.*, is preserved in the Archives of the Grand Duke of Tuscany. See Labbé, tom. xxxi, of the *Collection of Councils*, col. 1006. Edit. of Venice with the additions of *Mansi*.

Russians of the school of Kyjev, and by the Bishops of White Russia and Lithuania.[1] Even the celebrated Photian theologian, George Coressio, often mentioned by Allatius and Goar, testifies on this subject in favor of Rome and against Constantinople. He says: *The novelty of the opinions introduced into the Church* (of Constantinople) *by Nicholas Cabasila, who attributes* (as the present Patriarch does) *the consecration of the sacred oblation to the prayers, is certainly condemned. For this opinion is not expressed by any of the holy Fathers, nor ordained by any canon, nor is it in accord with the belief of the Church.*[2]

If the Most Holy Patriarch will deign to ponder over what we have hitherto said, he will perceive that, far from confuting the *Apostolic Letter* of Pope Leo XIII he has, on the contrary, strengthened its arguments, although quite against his will. The accusation of *anti-evangelical innovation*, falls back in this case, against the Church of Constantinople, and has no force against the Church of Rome.

XIX.

Let us pass next to the examination of another accusation with regard to the administration of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which the Patriarch makes against the Church of Rome. He alleges that she "denies to the laity the use of the sacred chalice, contrary to the command of the Lord, to the Catholic practice of the ancient Church and also to the express prohibition of many ancient orthodox Bishops of Rome."[3]

1 See the work of Haxthausen, *Le interne condizioni della Russia*, Hanover, 1847, P. I., p. 364.

2 Maffei, *Istoria Teologica*, Trento, 1742, App. Frammenti Greci, p. 31.

3 *Ἡ παπικὴ Ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τοῦ θ' αἰῶνος καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἐκαινοτόμησε καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἀποστερήσασα τοὺς λαικοὺς τοῦ ἱεροῦ ποτηρίου παρὰ τὴν διαταγὴν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τὴν καθολικὴν πρᾶξιν τῆς ἀρχαίας Ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῆν ῥητὴν ἀπαγόρευσιν πολλῶν ἀρχαίων ὀρθοδόξων τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπισκόπων.* ***Litterae Encyclicae.*** §. 11.

Our answer will be very short. We deny that there is a command of the Lord which obliges not only priests who offer the Sacrifice, but also the laity of both sexes to receive the Eucharist under the twofold species of bread and wine. The words of Christ: *Bibite ex hoc omnes*,[1] quoted by the Patriarch in proof of his assertion, were not directed indiscriminately to all the faithful, but to the Apostles *only*, to whom He also said: *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*,[2] and, therefore, they have reference *only* to those priests who offer the Sacrifice, represented on that occasion by the Apostles.

In vain does the Patriarch appeal to the Catholic practice of the ancient Church. This practice, instead of being in opposition to the Church of Rome, shows most clearly that the Church has always believed that it was sufficient for the laity to receive Communion under one species. This may be deduced from the Communion of the *sick*, of *infants* and of the *confessors of faith*. Everywhere from the beginning the Church administered the Holy Eucharist to the sick under only one species; to infants she gave Communion under the species of wine only; in time of persecution she permitted the confessors of faith to take the Holy Eucharist under the species of bread to their homes that they might fortify themselves with it in case of necessity. All these facts are well known and vouched for by Tertullian, Cyprian, Basil, Ambrose and many others whom the Patriarch will find quoted in every reputable author of Dogmatic Theology.[3]

And what shall we think of the "many orthodox Bishops of Rome who expressly prohibited Communion under one species? Although the Patriarch tells us that they were *many*, he takes good care in this place not to mention even one. From the familiarity which, as we have seen in the

1 Matth. xxvi, 27. 2 Luke xxii, 19.

3 See for ex. Franzelin, *Tract. de SS. Eucharistiae Sacramento et Sacrificio*, Thesis III. Ed. Romae, 1868; De Augustinis, *De Re Sacramentaria*, P. II, Art. VI, Ed. IIa., Romae 1879; Billot, *De Ecclesiae Sacramentis*, T. I, q. 80, Romae, 1895, p. 511.

preceding article, he shows that he has with the objections proposed in the XIII century by St. Thomas, we argue that one of the "many orthodox Popes" to whom he alludes, must be Pope Gelasius who governed the Church from 492 to 496. St. Thomas treating the question "*Utram liceat sumere Corpus Christi sine sanguine*,"[1] in his first *objection* writes thus: Videtur quod liceat: dicit enim *Gelasius Papa* et habetur De Consecr. (Dist. 2, c. 12): *Comperimus, quod quidam, sumpta tantummodo corporis sacri portione, a calice sacrati cruoris abstinent; qui procul dubio, quoniam nescio qua superstitione docentur adstringi, aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur;* non ergo licet sumere Corpus Christi sine eius sanguine."

Fortunately St. Thomas is not satisfied with merely proposing the objection; he also solves it, saying: "Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod Gelasius loquitur *quantum ad sacerdotes*, qui sicut totum consecrant sacramentum, ita etiam toti communicare debent: ut enim legitur in Conc. Toletano: *Quale erit sacrificium, cui nec ipse sacrificans particeps esse dignoscitur?*" Just as the Angelic Doctor defends Pope Gelasius, so will we be able to defend the other "many orthodox Popes," if the Patriarch gives us their names and their acts.

The illustrious Patriarch will certainly not deny that the Church has been constituted by Christ the dispenser of the divine mysteries: *Sic nos existimet homo ut ministros Christi et dispensatores mysteriorum Dei.*[2] Christ confiding to her this office conferred upon her consequently the authority of establishing such regulations as, under varying circumstances of the times, places and persons, would guarantee the reverence due to the sacred act, and which would most conduce to the spiritual advantage of the faithful. Thus, we see that St. Paul writing to the Corinthians ordains how they are to conduct themselves when partaking

1 *Summa Theologica*, P. III, quaest. 80, art. 12. Ed. Romae, 1887, p. 737.

2 I Cor. iv, 7.

of the Eucharist, and promises to regulate the rest at his coming to them.[1] What wonder then that the Church, making use of this authority given to her by Christ, does not permit the laity under present circumstances to use the chalice, since on the one hand there is no necessity for it, whilst on the other she thus guards the reverence towards this Sacrament? We say that necessity does not demand it; because we hold that under the species of bread Christ is received entirely, and hence the laity truly receive the Body and Blood of the Lord. The reverence due to this Sacrament is also safeguarded, for it is morally impossible that, when a great multitude of communicants, men and women, of every age and condition, approaches the sacred table, as it is customary in our Latin churches, the Precious Blood should not be spilt, or at least be exposed to the danger of being profaned. Moreover, many would abstain from communicating on account of the natural repugnance which they have to drink from a chalice which had touched the lips of others. If the Patriarch would successfully combat the practice of the Church of Rome, *a practice*, however, *which she does not prescribe for the Orientals*,[2] he must prove either the one or the other of these two things, namely, that the use of the chalice for the laity is necessary for eternal salvation, or that the Church has no authority to determine the manner of administering the sacraments. As long as he does not prove this,—and he will find it impossible to do so—his gratuitous accusations against the Church of Rome remain idle and vain words.

1 I Cor. xi, 34.

2 Benedict XIV in his Constitution *Allatae sunt*, n. 25, says of the Greeks living in Rome: "In Graecorum Collegio, quod Romae erectum fuit a Gregorio XIII, ea indicta lege, ut Graecus in eo Ritus servetur . . . iubentur Alumni in festis solemnioribus, videlicet diebus Paschatis, Pentecostes, et Nativitatis Domini, Eucharistiam *sub utraque specie* ritu graeco suscipere . . . Idemque ritus servatur cum reliquis Graecis omnibus, qui praedictis diebus ad solemne Missae Sacrificium conveniunt, aut qui aliis per annum diebus in Ecclesia Graeci Collegii, sibi Eucharistiam ritu graeco administrari deposcunt. *Ibid.* p. 259.

XX.

This is the case in a very special manner with regard to the seventh accusation of *innovation* launched by the Patriarch against the Church of Rome. It has reference to *Purgatory*, and is founded on a false conception of the doctrine held by the Church of Rome as of Catholic faith. This doctrine is reduced to two points, namely, to the existence of Purgatory and to the benefit which the souls detained there receive from the suffrages of the faithful here: "Definimus, si vere poenitentes in Dei caritate decesserint, antequam dignis poenitentiae fructibus de commissis satisfecerint et omissis, eorum animas poenis Purgatoriis post mortem purgari: et ut a poenis huiusmodi releventur, prodesse eis fidelium vivorum suffragia, Missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes et eleemosynas, et alia pietatis officia, quae a fidelibus pro aliis fidelibus fieri consueverunt secundum Ecclesiae instituta."[1] Now with regard to these two points of faith, there never was,[2] nor is there at present, a dissension between the Western and Eastern Churches. In fact, the separated Greek Chuaches have always professed these points in their Liturgies,[3] and in their Synod, held at Jerusalem in 1672, they expressly decreed: "Quos vero lethalium peccatorum desperatio non intercepit, sed ante mortem poenituit, at nullum fecerunt fructum poenitentiae semetipsos afflictando . . . suamque tum in Deum, tum in proximum caritatem operibus demonstrando, quae et catholica Ecclesia recte ab initio satisfactiones appellavit, *horum animas credimus ad inferos deduci*, ibique iustas pro iis peccatis poenas sustinere, ac suae tamen futurae liberationis esse conscias, et a summa bonitate *per sacerdotum orationes suorumque parentnm eleemosynas*

1 It was thus defined in the Council of Florence, *Decretum Unionis*, and in the Council of Trent, *Sess.* 25. See Denziger, *Enchiridion Symbol. et Definit.* Ed. VI. Wirceburgi, 1888, pp. 158 and 231.

2 Leo Allatius, *De utriusque Ecclesiae perpetua in dogmate de Purgatorio consensione.* Romae, Tip. Maronita, 1655.

3 See Nilles, Kalendarium Manuale utriusque Ecclesiae. Tom. II, c. 2, § 2. Oeniponte, 1881, pp. 379-387.

liberari. Ad hoc vero potissime valet incruentum missae sacrificium."[1]

Restricting, therefore, the question to that only which has been authentically defined, it is clear that the accusation of *anti-evangelical innovation* made against the Church of Rome is false and unjust. But, the Patriarch will perhaps say that there are theologians in the Church of Rome, who not only admit these two points, but have opinions concerning the place of Purgatory and the nature of the pains which are endured there, which Greek theologians will not admit. Let it be so. But this would not constitute a difference of *belief* between us and the separated Eastern Churches, but rather a difference of *opinions* among theologians of the Western and Eastern Churches; a difference which is of such a nature that, we are sure, the *common consent* of all these theologians would declare it incapable of constituting a valid impediment to the desired union of the Churches, so far as the canons of faith are concerned.

But it is time to pass on to the last point of the present controversy, that is, to that which is the *true* point of dissension between the Church of Rome and the Oriental Churches separated from her. With this point, which has reference to the Primacy of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff over the whole Church, we shall in the next issue conclude our answer to the Patriarchal *Encyclical* of Constantinople.

S. M. BRANDI, S. J.

Civiltà Cattolica,
Rome, Italy.

1 Can. 18. Himmel, *Monumenta Fidei Orientalis*, p, 1.

THE JURISDICTION OF LATIN BISHOPS OVER CATHOLICS OF THE GREEK RITE.[1]

THE question regarding the relative position of the Latin and Greek Clergy is becoming daily more important in the United States, owing to the constantly increasing immigration from countries of the East, where what is commonly called the Greek rite prevails.

These immigrants belong in reality to many races differing in origin, in language, in traditions and customs. They come not only from the Greek peninsula, but from Sicily, where they have settled from time immemorial, from Hungary and Transylvania, from Galicia, Bulgaria, Turkey, Syria, Egypt, Aethiopia and Abyssinia.

They are all one in faith, that is to say, they believe the doctrines of the One, Holy, Apostolic Church, and recognize the Sovereign Pontiff at Rome as the successor of St. Peter and chief of all the Churches, to whose decisions they conform in all matters. On this account they are called *Uniates* or *United Greeks*, to distinguish them from the *schismatic* Greek Christians who have separated from the true Church and the Roman Pontiff, although they call themselves the *orthodox Church*. Such are the great mass of the Russian people, who, whilst they have many Catholic doctrines, recognize only the Czar as their supreme head in ecclesiastical matters. In other parts of the East, similar schismatic bodies maintain separate Churches under Patriarchs who are partly religious and partly political heads of the nationalities which they represent.[2]

But the United Greeks Catholics (*Uniates*), those, namely, who maintain their union with the Holy See of Rome, retain their ancient liturgy, rites, discipline and distinctive usages. This difference, like their difference of languages or archi-

1 Cf. De Rituum Relatione juridica, auctore Aug. Arndt, S. J. Off. Analecta. Via dei Coronari 181, Romae. Pr. 1 Fr. 25c.

2 It is these to whom the Holy Father has addressed his Encyclical, inviting them to return to the unity of faith with the Apostolic Church. See the articles on the "Union of the Churches," by P. Brandi, S. J., in this and two preceding numbers of the REVIEW.

tecture, does not imply a difference of faith, but only a difference in the *expression* of that faith. We find the same in the Latin Church, where the Roman rite is distinct from the Ambrosian (in the Church of Milan), or from the Mozarabic (Spain), or from the rites of various religious Orders, like the Dominicans, who celebrate the mass and divine office in a different way, without professing a different creed.

In like manner, speaking of the Greek or Oriental rite, we distinguish actually four different classes of that rite, namely the *Greek proper*, the *Armenian*, the *Syrian*, and the *Coptic*.

For a better understanding of these relations, we group them in the following table, which indicates the variety of Catholic rite practiced by the different Oriental (including Asiatic and African) races.

The Oriental (Greek) rite comprises:

GREEK.	ARMENIAN.	SYRIAN.	COPTIC.
Greeks proper.	Armenians. (In parts of Galicia, Turkey and Western Asia.)	Syrians.	Copts of Egypt. (Under the recently restored hierarchy.)
Melchites.		Syr. Maronites.	
Rumanians. (Hungary and Transylvania.)		Syr. Chaldeans and Malabares.	Abyssinians.
Slavs. (Ruthenia and Bulgaria.)			

The Holy See has always insisted that these external differences of rite, to which long usage has made the people accustomed and attached, should be maintained intact in each of the Churches; although in particular circumstances the Sovereign Pontiff has found it necessary to ordain certain changes calculated to prevent abuses.

Since the Roman Church is the "Mother and Mistress of all the Churches," her observances are, according to the

expression of Benedict XIV, to be regarded as of superior rank when there is question of comparison. Hence it is customary to give jurisdiction to bishops of the Latin rite over subjects who follow the Greek rite; but the contrary is never done, so that a Greek bishop is not placed over Catholics of the Latin rite. (Pius VII, Const. Imposita humilitatis. Jul. 1823).

According to a decree of the S. Congregation of Propaganda (13 June 1891) a Greek priest wishing to emigrate to America must first make application to the Holy See and state definitely to what part of the United States he intends to go, so that the bishop of the locality to which he goes may be notified in advance. On his arrival in the new diocese the Greek priest has to present himself with his credentials from the Propaganda, to the bishop, who gives him the necessary faculties and to whose immediate jurisdiction he becomes for the time being subject. (S. C. Prop. 10 Mai. 1892.[1])

The Latin bishops in whose dioceses there are a number of Greek priests administering separate congregations are advised to appoint, each, a *Vicarius* who is to have charge of the ecclesiastical affairs of these Catholics. "Generatim quoad jurisdictionem episcoporum latinorum super sacerdotes et fideles rituum orientalium versantes extra limites propriae dioeceseos ea valent quae can. IX Conc. Later. IV statuta sunt." This canon reads as follows:

"Quoniam in plerisque partibus intra eamdem civitatem atque dioecesim permixti sunt populi diversarum linguaram, habentes sub una fide varios ritus et modos: districte praecipimus, ut pontifices hujusmodi civitatum sive dioecesum provideant viros idoneos, qui secundum diversitates rituum et linguarum divina officia illis celebrent, et ecclesiastica sacramenta ministrent, instruendo eos verbo pariter et exemplo. Prohibemus autem omnino, ne una eademque civitas sive dioecesis diversos pontifices habeat, tanquam unum corpus diversa capita, quasi monstrum.—Sed si propter praedictas causas urgens necessitas postulaverit, pontifex loci catholicum praesulem nationibus illis conformem provida deliberatione constituat sibi vicarium in praedictis, qui ei per omnia sit obediens et subjectus."

1 The Holy See has for the present acceded to the request of the American bishops, not to send married priests to administer to the Greek churches in the United States.

The Holy See here expressly states that these Catholics, though of a different rite, are to be cared for, as regards the administration of the sacraments and the general direction of their clergy, by the Latin bishop in whose diocese they live.

In view of the protection which is to be extended to the Greek Catholics in our dioceses, the question arises what is the relation of the priests of both rites to each other—first, in point of rank; secondly, in regard to supplementing each other's jurisdiction in cases of contact.

(1.) In point of dignity there is no distinction between priests of the Latin and Greek rites. In assemblies where both meet, each priest takes his position according to the date of his ordination. The same holds good with regard to prelates, who, of course, precede simple priests.[1] This suggests the advisability of keeping in the Episcopal chancery the list of dates of ordinations and promotion for the Greek clergy of the diocese, who, when they have mastered the English language, are qualified to participate in the retreats and other gatherings of the diocesan clergy for the promotion of a common cause.

(2.) As to interference in the missionary jurisdiction, between the Latin and Greek clergy, it is to be observed that, as no priest of either rite is allowed to adopt the liturgical practices and ecclesiastical discipline of the other, so the priests of both rites are also prohibited from making converts to their own ritual discipline among the faithful. This prohibition is so strict that a priest who attempts to induce a Catholic of a different rite to change in favor of his own, is *ipso facto* suspended in the exercise of his ecclesiastical functions.[2]

The promiscuous union of the two rites is likewise for-

1 S. R. C. Decr. 16 Feb. 1650; S. Congr. Prop. 6 Oct. 1863.

2 Missionarius quilibet latinus e clero seculari vel regulari, qui orientalem quempiam ad latinum ritum consilio auxiliove inducat, praeter suspensionem a divinis, quam ipso facto incurret, ceterasque paenas per constitutionem *Demandatam* inflictas officio suo privetur et excludatur.—SS. D. Leo XIII Bulla: ***Orientalium dignitas Ecclesiarum***.

bidden by the provisions of Canon law. Hence a Latin bishop or priest cannot lawfully adopt the vestments of the Greek Church, nor a Greek bishop or priest use those of the Latin Church.[1] The Holy See, when asked whether a Latin priest might make use of the Holy Oils blessed by a Greek bishop answered: *non expedire.*[2] Nevertheless, the practice of Latin priests celebrating Mass in churches of the Greek rite, and the reverse, has been sanctioned by the Holy See, provided the churches do not belong to the schismatic Greeks. In these cases the priest must, however, observe his own rite in celebrating.[3]

As regards the *Sacrament of Penance* the Holy See has declared that any Latin or Greek Catholic may receive absolution from a priest of either rite who enjoys proper jurisdiction in the diocese. Hence, Greek Catholics may go to confession to a priest of the Latin rite in his own church and be absolved; and in the same manner Latin Catholics may confess to a Greek priest who can understand them, and receive absolution from him. Nor can a bishop forbid the faithful to do so, except there be other special reasons besides those arising from the difference of rites.[4]

1 Bened. XIV. *Allatae sunt. n. 33.*

2 S. C. S. Off. 16 jun. 1831.

3 According to St. Alphonsus (Theol. mor. VI n. 203 dub. 2) a Latin priest traveling in a country where a church of his own rite cannot be found, may celebrate in leavened bread; whilst a Greek in a country, where there is no church of his own rite, may use unleavened bread.

4 Potestne Orientalis latinum confessarium adire et vice versa Latinus orientalem? Responsum offerunt S. Cong. de Prop. Fide 2 jun. 1835 ad Archiep. Alepp. Graeco-Melchit. "S. Sedes semper hoc principium tenuit, non debere ullo modo libertatem christianorum coarctari in re adeo delicata ut est sacramentalis confessio, semperque voluit, ut cuivis licitum esset culpas suas ei inter sacros ministros approbatos manifestare qui ipsi esset gratior. Similiter nunquam prohibuit, ne confessarius approbatus in propria ecclesia confessiones cujusvis catholici exciperet, qui ipsi se ad s. tribunal sisteret. Sic non est christianis interdictum ab una dioecesi in alteram se pro confessione peragenda conferre. Insuper etsi pro implendo praecepto paschali christianus debeat in propria parochia S. Communionem percipere, non obligatur tamen hac occasione apud parochum confiteri. Haec fuit semper et est maxima et praxis servata a S. Sede. Numquam porro ulla ritus distinctio facta est, cum praesertim administratio huius

As regards the administration of the Bl. Eucharist, the general principle is to be observed: Every one is to receive the Holy Communion in his own rite.[1]

There are two exceptions. If a Latin priest find himself among Catholics of the Armenian rite who receive Holy Communion under one form, he may distribute Holy Communion consecrated according the Armenian rite; and an Armenian priest in the same place may distribute Holy Communion consecrated according to the Latin rite. Each is, however, obliged to use his own ritual language and form of administering the Sacred Species.[2]

The second case is that in which Catholics of a particular rite have no church or priest of their own rite. Here they can receive not only the Viaticum, but the Holy Communion as often as they are prompted through devotion to approach, from a priest of any rite.[3]

From this it is easy to infer what the mind of the Holy See is with regard to the *obligation of hearing Mass* in the churches of either rite. A Greek Catholic may attend the Latin Church and satisfy the obligation of the ecclesiastical precept; and a Latin Catholic may do the same in a Greek church. But in neither case can the pastor induce the faithful of a different rite who attend his church, to abandon their

sacramenti non feret secum mutationem ritus, imo S. Sedes ipsa, quoties dubium super particulari hac re mota est, declaravit, non debere in tali genere ullam limitationem poni. Unde anno 1626 die 5 jun. severe prohibuit aliquibus episcopis latinis, ne subditos suos impedirent a confessione apud sacerdotes ruthenos instiuenda et vice versa."

1 S. C. off. 4 Sept. 1721.

2 S. C. Prop. 30 Apr. 1866 ad 2.

3 "Quo utilius frequentia promoveatur SS. Sacramentorum, quae efficacissima sunt media a Christo Domino instituta ad procurandam salutem animarum, et quo opportunius duplex illud praedictum inconveniens de medio tollatur, omnibus fidelibus cuiuscumque ritus, sive latini, sive orientalis, degentibus in locis, in quibus non sit ecclesia aut sacerdos proprii ritus, facultas in posterum a S. Sede conceditur SS. Communionem non modo in articulo mortis et pro paschali praecepto adimplendo, sed etiam quovis tempore devotionis gratia iuxta ritum ecclesiae existentis praedictis locis dummodo catholica sit recipiendi." S. C. Prop. 2 Jul.—18 Aug. 1893.

proper rite, nor claim them as his parishoners if they have a priest of their own.[4]

In regard to the jurisdiction exercised by our Bishops over the clergy of the Greek rite, it must be borne in mind that this jurisdiction is in all cases only *temporary*. If the subject returns to his home or places himself subsequently under the jurisdiction (having obtained the necessary permission) of a bishop of his own rite, he is at perfect liberty from the Latin jurisdiction to which he belonged for the time of his ministration in the diocese. "Quicumque orientalis extra patriarchale territorium commorans sub administratione sit cleri latini, ritui suo permanebit adscriptus, ita ut nihil diurturnitate aliave causa ulla suffragante recidat in ditionem Patriarchae, simul ac in ejus territorium revenerit." (Leo XIII Litt. Apost. *Orientalium dignitas* n. 9.)

For this reason the bestowal of faculties by our Bishops upon the Greek clergy is limited, that is to say it excludes the dispensing power from the essential observances of the Greek discipline, such as the peculiar feasts, fasts, ceremonial, etc., of the Eastern Church.

In places where the Greek Catholics have no priest or church of their own, it may be laid down as a general principle, that the Latin priest is authorized to administer to them all the sacraments, provided he do so in his own rite, and with-

4 Circa dubium, num orientales possint frequentare ecclesias latinas, duo principia sunt notanda: Prius libertatem et devotionem individuorum in tuto ponit, secundum favet ritui quin laedat alterum principium, Unum stabilit, non esse prohibitum nec posse prohiberi fidelibus ritus orientalis, ne frequentent ecclesias Latinorum sive alterius cuiusvis ritus orientalis catholici. Alterum inculcat, non solum non debere orientales ab ecclesiis proprii ritus abstrahi, verum etiam ab ipsis missionariis latinis adhortandos esse, ut eas frequentent maxime diebus festis. In hoc sensu semper S. Congregatio mentem suam expressit, ita tamen ut insimul episcopis orientalibus indicaret, eos non posse prohibere fideles sui ritus, ne Latinorum ecclesias frequentent, et decideret, ad satisfaciendum praecepto auscultandi missam non obligari fideles illi proprio ritu celebratae adsistere. Eadem vero non omisit missionarios Europaeicos adhortari, ut orientales monerent, ut suas ecclesias, maxime diebus festis frequentarent." (Epist S. C. ad Deleg. Ap. Egypt. 30 Apr. 1862.)

out, obliging them to change their allegiance permanently from the Greek to the Latin observance.[1]

From what has been said, it must plainly appear how necessary it is, in order to secure the salvation of the numerous Catholics belonging to the Greek rite in the United States, that our clergy as well as the hierarchy endeavor to facilitate friendly relations and a proper understanding of the mutual relations to which we are bound. Our own people need to be instructed that these strangers are brothers, adopted to the same inheritance with ourselves and claiming participation in the mysteries of our Holy Faith by a just right. On the other hand means should be adopted to enlighten those Catholics of the Greek rite who have no priests of their own, that they may seek the sacraments and graces of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in the house of their Latin brethren.

H. J. HEUSER.

DE FACULTATE BENEDICENDI ET IMPONENDI SCAPULARE B. M. V. DE MONTE CARMELO

VI ARTICULI 9ni FORMULAE C..

Res notissima est, inter Sacerdotes harum regionum de facultate praedicta diversas ortas esse dubietates.[2] Ad hanc

1 Catholici orientales morantes in loco, ubi parochus proprii ritus non existit, possunt in omnibus sequi ritum latinum. Id confirmavit S. Congreg. 29 mart. 1824 addens: Durante absentia episcopi vel parochi proprii ritus et ad formam Constitutionum Benedicti XIV *Demandatam et Allatae*. Item 4 februarii 1837 respondit Vic. Apost. Babyl. in omnibus sequendam esse regulam 22 augusti 1769 statutam: Quatenus (orientales) careant ecclesia et parocho, permitti posse, ut a Latinis accipant quae respiciunt participationem Sacramentorum et functiones ecclesiasticas, servato in reliquis proprio ritu.—Ubi vero missionarius latinus parochi fungitur officio in ecclesia orientali, fideles orientales licite ab eo Sacramenta Baptismi, Extremae Unctionis ac Matrimonii ritu latino recipiunt —S. C. Prop. 11 dec. 1838 ad I. (Conf. *De Rit. Relatione Juridica*. pag. 66.)

2 Cfr. Pastoralblatt für Nordamerica 1891 pag. 132 et 1895 pag. 23.—Commentarium in Facultates Apostolicas concinnatum a P. Konings ed 2. pag. 96. Idem ed. 3. curante Jos. Putzer, pag. 314.

rem solide et pro omni tempore componendam in supplicatione scripta puncta hinc illinc prolata Excellentissimo Domino Delegato Apostolico proposui in hunc fere modum.

In *Formula C. Art. 9.* Episcopis Statuum foederatorum Americae Septemtrionalis conceditur facultas erigendi Confraternitatem B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo . . . cum applicatione omnium indulgentiarum et privilegiorum, quae Summi Pontifices eidem Confraternitati impertiti sunt: addita potestate hanc facultatem communicandi presbyteris sacro ministerio fungentibus.

Jam circa quaestionem, an hac in facultate etiam contenta sit facultas, non quidem omnibus fidelibus, sed membris tantum confraternitatis ab Episcopo erectae benedicendi et imponendi Scapulare B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo, non una est inter sacerdotes hujus regionis sententia.

Communius quidem (ni fallor) affirmant ex eo, quod in facultate Articuli erectio confraternitatis conceditur cum *applicatione omnium privilegiorum*, quae Summi Pontifices huic confraternitati impertiti sunt; principale autem ejusdem privilegium in eo consistit, ut per gestationem Scapularis hujus confraternitatis insignes praerogativae et gratiae eidem adnexae percipiantur.

E contra alii non pauci hoc omnino negant et semel atque iterum in foliis publicis praefatam sententiam tanquam erroneam denunciaverunt.

Insistunt nempe praesertim responso cuidam a S. Congregatione Indulgentiarum Eminentissimo Archiepiscopo Cameracensi (Petro Cardinali Giraud) dato, vi cujus cum facultate erigendi confraternitatem B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo, *a Sede Apostolica* obtenta, minime conjuncta est facultas benedicendi et imponendi Scapulare B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo. Praefatus scil. Archiepiscopus Cardinalis praeter alia proposuit dubium:

"Utrum moderatores Sodalitatum B. M. V. de Rosario et de Monte Carmelo valeant benedicere rosaria et scapularia cum applicatione indulgentiarum assuetarum eo ipso quod supradictos moderatores instituerit in erigendo praelaudatas Societates cum assuetis indulgentiis, etc. Apostolica dele-

gatione sibi concessa, etsi Breve illi impertitum non mentionem faciat de indulta facultate moderatoribus ad effectum benedicendi hujusmodi rosaria et Scapularia" . . . ?

Sac. Congregatio . . . die 22 Febr. 1847 respondendum duxit: "Affirmative juxta Votum, *i. e.*, consulendum SSmo pro sanatione quoad praeteritum et pro facultate eidem Eminentissimo Archiepiscopo Cameracensi, ut per se vel per sacerdotes a se deputandos benedicat rosaria et scapularia, illaque respective imponat fidelibus ad lucrandas indulgentias unicuique ex confraternitatibus praedictis ab Apostolica Sede concessas."

"Facta autem . . . relatione in Audientia habita die 12 Julii 1847 . . . Sanctitas Sua . . . benigne annuit pro sanatione quoad praeteritum et quoad futurum concessit facultatem Archiepiscopo Eminentissimo Cameracensi, ejus vita naturali durante, prout in dicto dubio responsum est." (Decreta authentica S. Congr. Indulg. et Reliq. edita jussu et auctoritate SSmi D. N. Leonis XIII. n. 343 ad 1 mum et in fine.)

Unde cum in dicto Articulo 9. Formulae C. tantum facultas erigendi confraternitatem B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo concessa, de altera autem facultate, scil. benedicendi et imponendi Scapularia nulla fiat mentio, haec ultima facultas, ad amussim Responsi ad Eminentissimum Archiepiscopum Cameracensem dati, neque in Articulo 9. dictae Formulae erit contenta, id autem, quod de applicatione omnium privilegiorum in eo additur, ad alia privilegia magis cum dicta confraternitate connexa conferri debebit. Caeterum confraternitates a Sede Apostolica erectae non iisdem privilegiis fruuntur, ac illae, quae ordinario modo, *i. e.*, per aggregationem ad Archiconfraternitates a religiosis Ordinibus vi specialium concessionum eriguntur, prout ad dubium Episcopi Limovacensis:

"Confraternitates ab Episcopo auctoritate a S. Sede delegata erectae, fruuntur necne eadem bonorum operum et orationum communione cum Archiconfraternitate et *iisdem privilegiis* et indulgentiis ac illae, quae aggregatae ordinario more fuerunt?" S. Congr. Indulg. die 22 Aug. 1842 re-

spondit: "*Affirmative*, si agitur de Confraternitate SS. Corporis Christi, si vero de Doctrina Christiana, quoties in Diocesi aggregata est una ex his Confraternitatibus, caeterae etiam erectae aut erigendae, aggregatae censentur;—*Negative*, quoad alias Confraternitates in genere." (Decr. auth. n. 308 ad 4.) Quare in Confraternitate B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo, si erigitur a Generali PP. Carmelitarum, conceditur facultas benedicendi membris scapulare de Monte Carmelo, non item si erigitur vi facultatis a S. Sede obtentae.

Quaeritur ergo et cum agatur de re valde practica, enixe petitur responsum decisivum in dubio:

An in facultate Articuli 9, Form. C. erigendi Confraternitatem B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo etiam contenta sit facultas benedicendi et et imponendi Scapulare membris dictae Confraternitatis?

Responsum ex Delegatione Apostolica sub Nro. 2159, die 22 Sept. 1895 transmissum ita sonat:

VERY REV. DEAR FATHER:

In reply to the *dubium* sent to the Propaganda concerning the faculty to bless and impose the scapular of the B. V. M. del Carmine, whether the faculty, Formula C., Art. 9, to erect the Confraternity includes the faculty to bless and impose said scapular, the Cardinal Prefect, by letter of Sept. 11, 1895, declares that: "The S. C. has answered negatively, since they are two distinct faculties. And in fact, as in Formula C., Art. 9, is given the faculty to erect the Confraternities of the Most Holy Rosary, of M. SS. del Carmine, etc., so, in another and distinct formula is granted the faculty of enrolling the faithful in those Confraternities, *and* of blessing and imposing the scapulars. This is in full conformity with the decree of the S. Congr. of Indulgences, of 1847, cited in the presentation of the dubium, which decree resolves clearly the proposed question."

With sentiments of highest esteem and fraternal charity,

I remain, most faithfully yours in Christ,

✠ FR. *Archp.* SATOLLI, *Del. Apost.*

VERY REV. JOSEPH PUTZER, C. SS. R.

Ex hoc responso jam liquet, facultate Articuli 9. Formulae C. qua conceditur Episcopis nostris erectio confraternitatis B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo ("del Carmine"), non comprehendi alteram facultatem, scil. benedicendi et imponendi membris hujus confraternitatis scapulare correspondens huic confraternitati, sed speciale ad hoc requiri indultum, ideoque id quod hucusque in Commentario facultatum l. c. hac de re propositum fuit, esse emendandum; idemque tenendum esse etiam de benedictione rosariorum, quatenus ea facienda esset pro membris Confraternitatis SS. Rosarii vi facultatis praedicti articuli.

Ratio responsi, prout eam Emus Cardinalis Praefectus addere dignatus est, duplex est.

1. Stylus seu mos, apud S. Sedem vigens, facultates, quas concedit, ita specificandi, ut ea, quae non est expresse concessa, pro non concessa sit habenda. Hanc regulam in formulis, a S. Congregatione S. Officii compositis et per S. Congregationem de Propaganda Fide pro regionum necessitate Episcopis Vicariisque Apostolicis communicari solitis, quod punctum hujus quaestionis attinet, revera observari, ex tenore plurium formularum,[1] quarum unam Eminentissimus Cardinalis Praefectus prae oculis habuit, plane evidens fit.

Etenim in Formula F. Episcopis Novae Scotiae, in Formula P. Episcopis Angliae, in formula S. in Africa, et in formula R. Vicariis Apostolicis Indiarum Orientalium (nunc Episcopis?) concedi solitis Articulus praesens ita sonat:

"Erigendi intra fines suae Dioecesis, exceptis locis, ubi adsunt (*seu* in locis sui Vicariatus, in quibus non existunt) Regulares ex privilegio sui Ordinis ejusmodi facultate gaudentes, quascumque pias Sodalitates, a S. Sede approbatas, iisque adscribendi utriusque sexus Christifideles, *ac* benedicendi coronas et scapularia earundem Sodalitatum propria cum applicatione omnium indulgentiarum, quas Summi Pontifices praedictis Sodalitatibus, coronis et scapularibus impertiti sunt." In formula B., quae in Sinis, Cochinchina, Japonia et Tonkin communicatur, haec verba occurrunt:

1 Cfr. Nouv. Revue Théol. vol. xxi, pag. 487.

"Erigendi in iisdem locis (sibi subjectis) sodalitates Ssmi Cordis Jesu, Ssmi Rosarii, et Scapularis B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo et omnes alias confraternitates ab hac S. Sede approbatas cum facultate eisdem adscribendi utriusque sexus fideles, ac benedicendi coronas et scapularia earundem confraternitatum propria cum applicatione omnium indulgentiarum et privilegiorum, quae Summi Pontifices tum confraternitatibus, tum coronis et scapularibus impertiti sunt." In hisce ergo formulis praeter facultatem erigendi confraternitates SS. Rosarii et Scapularis B. M. V. de M. Carm. expresse additur facultas pro Rosario et Scapulari eis correspondentibus. Sed quare? Quia S. Sedes etiam hanc facultatem addere *voluit;* et quia juxta commune adagium facultates tantum valent, quantum verba, quibus conceduntur, sonant, ideo eam expresse addere debuit, ut indultarii scire possent, quid eis esset concessum. Ex quo demum necessario concludendum est, in illis facultatum articulis, quibus concessio erigendi confraternitates SS. Rosarii et Scapularis de Monte Carmelo fit, quin expresse addatur facultas benedicendi ipsum Rosarium et Scapulare, hanc facultatem minime esse concessam. Hujusmodi articulus non tantum in Formula C invenitur, quae Episcopis nostris communicatur, sed etiam in Formula O pro Nova Zealandia destinata, in qua Articulus Confraternitates spectans tenoris est, qui sequitur: "Erigendi Confraternitates Sanctissimi Rosarii et Scapularis B. M. V., Ssmi Cordis Jesu, Propagationis Fidei nec non alias confraternitates pietatis ab Apostolica Sede jam approbatas cum applicatione omnium et singularum indulgentiarum et privilegiorum, quae Summi Pontifices praedictis confraternitatibus impertiti sunt." Ex praedictis sequitur, neque in hoc articulo facultatem contineri benedicendi Rosaria et Scapularia ad confraternitates in eo contentas pertinentia, licet illae erigi possint cum applicatione omnium privilegiorum a SS. Pontificibus impertitorum, ut in Formula C.

2. Altera ratio ab Emo. Card. Praefecto inducta pro vindicatione responsi negativi desumitur ex responso S. Congr. Indulg. supra exposito. Profecto hoc responsum ab auctore "Commentarii in facultates apostolicas" antequam editi-

onem hujus opusculi compararet, bene fuit perpensum, et cum res notissima alioquin semper fuerit, facultatem erigendi confraternitatem B. M. V. de M. Carm. ab altera benedicendi et imponendi Scapulare ejusdem nominis non tantum separari posse, sed hanc cum illa reapse non concedi, nisi concessio aliquo modo exprimatur, facile istud responsum tanquam concessio *juxta petita* explicatum fuit. Supponi enim potuit, Archiepiscopum Cameracensem, qui tunc Cardinalis S. R. E. creatus fuit, simplici supplicatione Summum Pontificem adiisse, ut sibi facultatem concedere dignaretur, praeter alias confraternitates etiam illam SSmi. Rosarii et Scapularis B. M. V. de Monte Carm. erigendi, nihil dicendo de Rosario et Scapulari ipsis ; Summum vero Pontificem, cum Rescriptum in forma Brevis reddi jusserit, id quidem, quod in supplica petitum fuit, scil. facultatem pro erectione confraternitatum praefatarum indulsisse, non autem facultatem pro benedictione Rosariorum et Scapularium, eo quod haec in supplicatione non petebatur. Responso ita considerato vix perspici potuit, quomodo ex eo vis probandi pro parte contraria derivaretur. At vero S. Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, prout ex responso de anno 1895 patet, stat pro parte contraria, scil. in Form. C. Art. 9. non esse contentam facultatem benedicendi et imponendi scapulare de Monte Carmelo et hoc quidem ea de causa, quod facultas in Art. praedicto ad hoc non est concessa, allegatque Emus Congregationis Praefectus ad decisionem confirmandam responsum de anno 1847 ad Emum Archiep. Cameracensem, ideo reverenter, uti par est, S. Congregationi ejusque Emo Praefecto deferendum est.

Quaestio, quae remanet enucleanda, haec est :

Quid illis nunc faciendum, qui erronee hucusque, vi art. 9. Formulae C. confraternitate Scapularis erecta, membrorum ejus scapularia benedixerunt iisque imposuerunt ?

Respondeo breviter :

1. Confraternitas Scapularis B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo, supposito, quod conditiones ad ejus erectionem requisitae fuerint observatae, valida remanet, cum simus in regione S. Congregationi de Propaganda Fide subjecta, ad quam Decre-

tum S. Congr. Indulg. de 6 Julii 1887[1] se non extendit, prout hoc Sctissimus Dominus in audientia Emi Card. Praefecti S. Congr. de Propaganda Fide expresse declaravit.[2] Investitiones vero in Scapulare B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo vi art. 9. Form. C. factae, invalidae sunt.

2. Pro reconvalidatione praeteritorum necnon pro facultate benedicendi et imponendi dicta Scapularia optimum erit, re sincere exposita supplicando recurrere ad Emum Praefectum S. C. de Prop. Fide. Caeterum haec facultas obtineri etiam potest Romae a Reverendissimo P. Generali Ord. Carmelitarum et quidem sive ab illo calceatorum in S. Maria Traspontina sive ab illo discalceatorum in Via della Panetteria, 45. Consultius autem esset (ob decretum S. C. Indulg. 22 Aug. 1842 supra allegatum), consensu et litteris testimonialibus Episcopi Dioecesani praevie obtentis, petere confraternitatis aggregationem in Archiconfraternitatem Romanam.

3. Quod impositiones praeteritas Scapularium attinet, videndum etiam est, an non ea revalidatae sint e. gr. tempore Missionum a PP. Redemptoristis habitarum. Prouti notum est, hi Patres ex indulto S. Rit. Congr. de 8 Jan 1803[3] et variis aliis concessionibus, investire possunt etiam multitudinem fidelium, singulis Scapulare sibi imponentibus, ita ut sic investiti hoc ipso in confraternitatem S. Scapularis sint recepti omnibusque ejus indulgentiis et gratiis fruantur, quin inscriptio nominum stricte necessaria sit.[4]

JOS. PUTZER, C.SS.R.

Baltimore, Md.

1 Ap. Act. S. Sed. XX, 253 et Beringer: Die Ablässe, ed. 10, pag. 524.

2 Cfr. AM. ECCL. REVIEW de anno 1889, p. 465. Pastoralblatt 1895, p. 80. Beringer l. c. p. 525.

3 Cfr. Decr. auth. S. Congr. Ind. n. 350.

4 Singula documenta cfr. ap. Ulrich: Trésor spirituel. Paris 1863, p. 137-144.

ANALECTA.

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE.

I.

DE INSTITUTIONE COMMISSIONIS PONTIFICIAE AD RECONCILIATIONEM DISSIDENTIUM CUM ECCLESIA FOVENDAM.

LEO PP. XIII

MOTV PROPRIO

Optatissimae in una fide reconciliationis earum gentium, quae a romana Ecclesia matre non uno tempore nec una de causa secesserunt, nova quodammodo Nos ponere initia et plena caritatis admovere invitamenta, iam inde ab apostolica epistola *Praeclara* studiose contendimus.—Ad rem quidem eam sumus aggressi, quae, ut alias monuimus, diuturni sit laboriosique operis, eademque utilitatis non ita proxime eventurae. At vero, praeter summam divinae opis fiduciam qua maxime sustentamur, optima quaeque sunt Nobis, adiumenta in id quaesita ; in primisque visum est pro gravitate et amplitudine causae opportunum, aliquot ex Dilectis Filiis Nostris S. R. E. Cardinalibus in communionem consiliorum adsciscere. Tales reapse institutas apud Nos congressiones, principio ad rationes ecclesiarum orientalium spectare voluimus ; placuitque propterea advocare et audire praesentes Venerabiles quoque Fratres, earumdem nationum vario ritu Patriarchas. Ita factum feliciter, ut quaedam rerum capita sint a Nobis editâ haud multo ante constitutione *Orientalium dignitas ecclesiarum* definita et decreta : quae tametsi per se ad veterem catholicorum legitimam per Orientem disciplinam conservandam tuendamque proprius pertinent, aeque tamen unitati aliis in gentibus redintegrandae posse conducere manifestum est.—Iamvero hunc Nos primum reputantes initarum congressionum fructum, eisque continuandis probe intelligentes quantum praesidii ad ceteras etiam propositorum partes iure liceat expectari, idcirco induximus animum illud providere ut huiusmodi institutum certiore quodam pacto certaque constantia, quamdiu ipsa postulaverit res, permaneat vigeatque secundum vota perutile.

Itaque sententiam Nostram litteris hisce tradentes, peculiare esse

ac stabile Consilium, sive, uti loquuntur, *Commissionem* decernimus atque edicimus, proprio munere et cura deditam reconciliationi dissidentium fovendae. Ea constabit ex nonnullis S. R. E. Cardinalibus, quos Pontifex nominatim designet, quibus ipse praesit, quique coram eo statos habeant conventus. Primosque ex instituto nominamus :

Miecislavm Ledochowski
Benedictvm Mariam Langénievx
Marianvm Rampolla del Tindaro
Vincentivm Vannvtelli
Aloisivm Galimberti
Heribertvm Vavghan
Iosephvm Mariam Granniello
Camillvm Mazzella.

Erunt praeterea, ut sacris in Consiliis urbanis assolet, convenienti numero Consultores, item a Pontifice designandi : in quibus pari loco ii habebuntur quos Patriarchae catholici orientales, tamquam legatos suos in Urbe consistentes, singuli singulos, destinaverint. Consultorum sit, doctrinam suam, prudentiam, rerum usum naviter conferre cognoscendis instruendisque causis quae in deliberationem Pontificis et Cardinalium, quos supra diximus, deferantur : deferet autem ille ex Consultoribus, cui Pontifex mandaverit eiusdem Commissionis esse ab actis ; cui propterea licebit eis ipsis pontificiis congressionibus ex officio interesse.

Haec vero consilia et decreta, quorum exitum auspiciis providentissimi Dei praecipue commendamus, rata firmaque consistere auctoritate Nostra volumus et iubemus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum die XIX martii anno MDCCCVC, Pontificatus Nostri decimo octavo.

LEO PP, XIII.

II.

BREVE DE AGGREGATIONE AD ARCHICONFRATERNITATEM S. MICHAELIS, SANATO PRAETERITO.

LEO PP. XIII.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.

Romanorum Pontificum Praedecessorum Nostrorum vestigiis inhaerentes, pias sodalitates ad pietatis opera exercenda institutas

peculiaribus privilegiis et facultatibus ornare ac ditare solemus. Iamvero cum dilecti filii curatores et sodales Archiconfraternitatis in Ecclesia loci Montis Sancti Michaelis dicti Dioecesis Constantiensis, sub invocatione ejusdem Beati Archangeli canonice erectae, supplices ad Nos preces admoverint ut sibi officialibus et sodalibus nunc et pro tempore existentibus facultatem aggregandi ubique terrarum concedere velimus; Nos hisce precibus benigne obsecundandum censuimus. Nos igitur exponentes et omnes ac singulos quibus hae litterae Nostrae favent a quibusvis excommunicationis et interdicti, aliisque ecclesiasticis sententiis, censuris et poenis, si quas forte incurrerint, hujus tantum rei gratia absolventes et absolutos fore censentes, Archisodalitatis supradictae officialibus et sodalibus praesentibus et futuris, ut ipsi alias quascumque sodalitates ejusdem nominis et instituti extra Urbem ubique terrarum existentes, eidem Archisodalitati servata tamen forma Constitutionis fe. me. Clementis PP. VIII, Praed. Nostri aliisque Apostolicis ordinationibus desuper editis, aggregare, illisque omnes et singulas indulgentias, peccatorum remissiones ac poenitentiarum relaxationes ipsi Archisodalitati ab h. S. Sede concessas et aliis communicabiles communicare licite possint et valeant, Auctoritate Nostra Apostolica harum litterarum vi in perpetuum concedimus. Quidquid vero a memoratis officialibus circa hujusmodi aggregationes tempore praeterito non legitime neque rite actum est, id Apostolica Nostra auctoritate sanamus et ratum habemus. Decernentes praesentes litteras semper firmas, validas et efficaces existere ac fore, suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri et obtinere, illisque ad quos spectat et in futurum spectabit in omnibus et per omnia plenissime suffragari, sicque in praemissis per quoscumque judices ordinarios et delegatos judicari ac definiri debere, atque irritum et inane si secus super his a quoquam quavis auctoritate scienter aut ignoranter contigerit attentari. Non obstantibus Constitutionibus et Ordinationibus Apostolicis et, quatenus opus sit, dictae Archisodaltitatis etiam juramento, confirmatione Apostolica aut alia quavis firmitate roboratis, statutis, ceterisque contrariis quibuscumque.

Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die XXIX martii MDCCCXCV, Pontificatus Nostri anno decimo octavo.

C. Card. DE RUGGIERO.

SSMUS LAUDAT OPUS PHILOSOPHICUM RMI BENEDICTI LORENZELLI.

LEO PP. XIII.

Dilecto Filio Benedicto Lorenzelli,

PRELATO NOSTRO DOMESTICO.

Dilecte Fili, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem. Tuum illud munus *Philosophiae Theoreticae Institutiones*, opus a te curis alteris castigatum et auctum, omnino gratum habuimus. In eo praeter ampliorem erga Nos pietatis tuae significationem, testatius quidem agnovimus quam tu religiose obtemperare studueris Nostris de philosophia christiana colenda et docenda praescriptis. Nam disciplinae magni Aquinatis te jampridem dedidisti totum ; id praecipue contendens ut admirabilem, qua ille excellit, philosophandi rationem et viam tractando illustrares. Quae mens et sollertia debuit certe, ut factum est, laboribus tuis ubertatem afferre, tibique opinionem ac laudem prudentiorum hominum conciliare.

Et quoniam Nos hoc etiam crebro inculcavimus, ut christianus philosophus et novitates errorum armis sapientiae veteris profligare nitatur, et recentiora doctrinarum incrementa demonstret nihil sane cum ea sapientia pugnare apteque potius congruere ; gratum idciro est, utrique te muneri operam peculiarem fidelemque dedisse.

Itaque tibi commendatio Nostra jam tum non defuit, cum in Urbe lectas clericorum coronas ad hanc disciplinam frugifera sedulitate institueres. eamdem nunc libenti animo impertimus, quum te, gravibus curis pro Apostolica Sede distentum, par movet studium ut illorum bono editis scriptis prospicias.

Volens autem faveat propositis Deus, omnis sapientiae auctor et dux, idem qui eam rite tradentes donat insigni praemio. Quorum votorum omniumque coelestium munerum auspicem, Apostolicam habe benedictionem, quam tibi paterne largimur.

Datum Roman apud S. Petrum die III Decembris anno MDCCCVC, Pontificatus Nostri decimo octavo.

LEO PP. XIII.

E. S. CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

I.

DE USU MATERIAE "NIPIS" DICTAE PRO ALBIS, AMICTIS, MAPPIS ETC. CONFICIENDIS.

Iosephus, Magister Scholarum Ecclesiae Cathedralis Placentinae in Hispania, iussit ex tela subtilissima vulgo "Nipis" nitiditate tenacitateque linum aemulante et aequante (quamvis colore plerumque inferior sit lino accuratissime dealbato) albas confici. Attente tamen inspecto Huius Sacrae Rituum Congregationis Decreto 15 Maii 1819, non est ausus eis uti, quia ex lino vel cannabe non essent confectae. Cum vero dicta tela longe pretiosior sit lino, nec materia, ex qua conficitur, ex arboris fructibus, sicut gossypium, proveniat, sed ex ipsius plantae filis, ut linum; et aliunde in laudato Huius Congnis Decreto expresse prohibeatur tantummodo ex gossypio componi, dubitans, utrum ei liceat praedictis albis uti, Sacrorum Rituum Congregationi humiliter subjecit sequentium Dubiorum solutionem: nimirum:

I.—Utrum ex tela, sive panno, vulgo "Nipis" possint confici corporalia, pallae, aut saltem amictus et mappae?

II.—Quatenus negative ad Primum: Utrum uti liceat iis iam confectis?

Et eadem Sacra Congregatio, exquisito etiam voto alterius e scientiarum naturalium peritis, reque mature perpensa, in Ordinariis Comitiis, subsignata die ad Vaticanum habitis, rescribendum censuit:

Ad I^{um} Negative ad utramque partem.

Ad II^{um} Affirmative, tantum quoad albas, amictus et mappas, usquedum consumentur.

Atque ita rescripsit et servari mandavit. Die 13 Augusti 1895.

II.

DE RECITATIONE PSALMI "DE PROFUNDIS" POST OFFICUM DEFUNCTORUM.

Sacra Rituum Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti secretarii, attentis expositis a Priore et Consilio secreto Archiconfraternitatis Sanctissimi Cordis Iesu erectae in Ecclesias Theodori de Urbe, reque mature perpensa, respondendum censuit:

Ad dubium: Utrum in anniversariis aliisque diebus, praeter dies commemorationis omnium fidelium defunctorum, et depositionis de-

functi, si totum officium defunctorum ritu duplici recitetur, omittendus sit post Laudes psalmus *De profundis?*

Negative: iuxta Rubricas Breviarii, Missalis et Ritualis Romani ac Decreta praesertim in 2ª *Einsidlen.* 4044 ad 29; die 23 Iulii 1736 ubi legitur: servetur Rubrica Breviarii Romani et Ritualis itidem Romani, et post Vesperas, et Laudes in Officio defunctorum omittantur psalmi: *De profundis* et *Lauda anima mea Dominum*, tantum in die omnium fidelium defunctorm, et in die depositionis defuncti; et in altera *Ordin. Erem. Camald. montis Coronae* 4085 ad IIᵐ die 9 Maii 1739. Atque ita servari mandavit die 10 Ianuarii 1896.

III.

DUBIA CIRCA SSMUM EUCHARISTIAE SACRAMENTUM.

Rmus Procurator Generalis Congregationis SSmi Sacramenti a Sacra Rituum Congregatione postulavit, ut sequentia Dubia declarare dignaretur nimirum:

I. An in Ecclesia dicata SSmo Eucharistiae Sacramento, quando fit officium de feria, debeat in suffragiis fieri commemoratio de SSmo Sacramento, omissa commemoratione de Cruce, vel potius commemoratio de Cruce omissa commemoratio de Smo Eucharistiae Sacramento?

II. Sacra Rituum Congregatio, decreto 3 Aprilis 1884, benigne indulsit Congregationi SSmi Sacramenti, ut feria V quae prima quolibet mense occurrit, recoli valeat sub ritu duplici maiori Commemoratio solemnis de SSmo Eucharistiae Sacramento, dummodo in eam feriam non incidat festum aequalis vel potioris ritus seu dignitatis.

Quaeritur 1. An haec solemnis Commemoratio habeat praecedentiam super festum secundarium eiusdem ritus, sed non eiusdem dignitatis cuiusmodi esset festum B. M. V. tam in occurrentia quam in concurrentia.

2. An eiusmodi solemnis commemorationis in concurrentia cum festo secundario eiusdem ritus et eiusdem dignitatis, Vesperae esse debeant de SSmo Sacramento vel de sequenti?

3. An post expositionem privatam SSmi Sacramenti, scilicet, aperto ostiolo tabernaculi, dari possit Benedictio cum eodem Venerabili Sacramento in pyxide recondito?

4. Sacerdos celebrans coram SSmo Sacramento patenter exposito dum in Evangelio dicit: "Et verbum caro factum est" genuflectit aliquantulum versus SSmum Sacramentum;

Quaeritur: An debeat versus idem Venerabile Sacramentum

inclinationem facere quotiescumque in lectione Evangelii pronuntiat nomen *Iesu?*

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio ad relationem infrascripti Secretarii, exquisito voto alterius ex Apostolicarum Caeremoniarum Magistris, dubiis mature diligenterque perpensis, respondendum censuit :

Ad I. *Affirmative* ad primam partem : *Negative* ad secundam.

Ad II. *Negative* ad primam quaestionem : Quoad alteram, totum de Festo cum commemoratione Officii votivi.

Ad III. *Affirmative.*

Ad IV. *Affirmative.* Atque ita recripsit. Die 30 Novembris 1895.

CAI. *Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA *S. R. C. Praef.*

A. TRIPEPI, *Secretarius.*

IV.

PLURA SOLVUNTUR DUBIA.

Rmus Dnus Ludovicus Hazarius Begin, Archiepiscopus Cyrenensis, Administrator Dioecesis Quebecensis, S. R. Congregationi sequentia Dubia diluenda humiliter proposuit, nimirum :

I. An Titulare Festum alicuius Ecclesiae, a die 31 Decembris ad 5 Ianuarii occurrens, habeat octavam?

II. Utrum dies 30 Dec. assignari possit S. Anastasiae Mart. in Ecclesia propria?

III. Utrum in Ecclesia propria Festum S. Titi celebrandum sit die 4ª. Ian. an 6ª. Februarii?

IV. Quomodo in Ecclesia S. Adriani Mart. cuius festum occurrit die octava Septembris, ordinari debeat officium Nativitatis B. M. V. et dies eius octava, cum dies 9ª. et 10ª. Sept. a festis duplicibus minoribus sint impeditae?

V. An valide possit Episcopus pro Titulari alicuius novae Ecclesiae designare festum, quod neque in Martyrologio, neque in Supplemento Dioecesis reperitur?

VI. Quonam tempore duodecim cerei ardere debeant in Anniversario Ecclesiae consecratae?

VII. Utrum die octava eiusdem Anniversarii Ecclesiae consecratae, cerei pariter accendi debeant, aut possint?

VIII. Utrum Decretum in Alifaxien. editum die 16ª. Aprilis, 1886, ad 3^{um}, iuxta quod dies electionis Episcopi, quoad anniversarium in Dioecesi celebrandum, non ea est qua Bullae datae fuerunt, sed illa qua fuit in Consistorio proclamatus, spectet etiam ad Episcopos per Sacram Congregationem de Propaganda Fide institutos, qui fre-

quenter Bullas receperunt, Dioecesis possessionem acceperunt, imo consecrati fuerunt aliquo tempore ante Consistorium, in quo proclamantur?

IX. Utrum lectiones II Nocturni, die octava alicuius Sancti, quae non reperiuntur in Breviario, debeant, deficiente Octavario, sumi de Communi primo loco, an vero de die festo iuxta Decretum in una Provinciae ecclesiasticae Quebecen., die 15 Apr. 1880 ad 4^{um}?

X. An Solemnitas SSmi Cordis Iesu possit iuxta regulas ceteris Solemnitatibus communes peragi?

XI. Utrum Ordinario liceat, ubi ad fovendam devotionem expedit, quibusdam Titularium Ecclesiarum parochialium Solemnitatibus assignare certas per annum Dominicas, etiam ab ipso die festo distantes?

XII. An Solemnitati Annuntiationis B. M. V. iam concessae, valeat assignari in perpetuum Dominica II^{a} post Pascha, nisi occurrat festum dup. primae classis?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, exquisito voto alterius ex Apostolicarum Caeremoniarum Magistris, reque mature perpensa, rescribendum censuit:

Ad I. *Affirmative*, iuxta Rubricas.

Ad II. *Affirmative*, non omissa commemoratione S. Anastasiae in secunda Missa Nativitatis, ratione Stationis.

Ad III. *Negative* ad primam partem, *affirmative* ad secundam, iuxta Martyrologium Romanum.

Ad IV. Quum die 8^{a}. Sept. faciendum sit de S. Adriaano Mart. Ecclesiae Titulo, die 9 eiusdem mensis fiat de Nativitate B. M. V. absque integra octava, prout Romae fit in Diaconia S. Adriani Mart., translato festo duplici illa die occurrente, in primam aliam liberam iuxta Rubricas.

Ad V. *Negative.*

Ad VI. Per integrum et solum diem, incipiendo a primis Vesperis.

Ad VII. *Negative* ad primam partem, *affirmative* ad secundam.

Ad VIII. *Affirmative.*

Ad IX. *Negative* ad primam partem, *affirmative* ad secundam.

Ad X. *Negative*, nisi sit festum de praecepto.

Ad XI et XII. *Negative.*

Atque ita rescripsit et servari mandavit.

Die 13 Decembris 1895.

CAI. *Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA, *S. R. C. Praef.*

L. ✠ S. A. TRIPEPI, *Secretarius.*

E. S. C. INDICIS.

DUBIUM.

Utrum qui habent generalem facultatem legendi libros in Indice Librorum prohibitorum contentos, legere licite possint etiam libros ab Ordinario proscriptos, sine speciali Ordinarii licentia?

Resp. (Episcopo Placentino) *Negative.*

E. CONGREGATIONE S. OFFICII.

DUBIUM DE SOCIETATIBUS OCCULTIS DEFINITIVE VETITIS.

Eme ac Rme Domine:

Postquam Societates occultae, quae istis in regionibus coaluerunt diversis nominibus *Equitum Pythiae*, *Sociorum Singularium*, *Filiorum Temperantiae*, definitive Sanctae Sedis decreto universis istarum regionum Ordinariis, ut probe novit Eminentia Tua, significato, utpote intrinseca pravitate laborantes, reprobatae ac vetitae fuerunt, nulli catholicorum veri nominis dubium superesse potest eas esse graviter illicitas. Ex quo recte consequitur illos omnes et singulos, qui se catholicos profitentur, teneri, nisi gravissimum animae suae damnum subire velint, easdem societates, quibus quomodocumque sese adscripserunt, deserere, et ab illis et ab earum unaquaque sese plene ac perfecte separare, quavis participatione exclusa: illos vero, qui id praestare recusent, recipiendorum sacramentorum esse et habendos esse indignos tanquam in peccato obfirmatos.

Quae cum probata sint omnibus et esse debeant, ex parte plurium Episcoporum singulares casus huic Sanctae Sedi propositi sunt, ut decernatur an aliquid hac in re permitti possit, causa damni materialis vitandi. Cum enim statuta illarum societatum singulis sociis indulgeant ut, erogata modica pecuniae summa ad instar taxae statis temporibus solvandae, jus adquirant socii ad longe majora subsidia sive pro se in casibus infirmitatis aut necessitatis, sive pro familia mortis casu, si societati nuncio misso et quavis participatione remota, cessent quoque a praescripta taxa solvenda, illud unum consequetur, non societati sed sibi ipsis nocivum, ut et amittant omne id, quod vel pluribus abhinc annis solvisse constabit, et

omni spe excidant subsidia ea ratione pacta sibi vel familiae percipiendi. Etiam quandoque contingit ut quis, obligatione in forma juris valida, societati sic damnatae teneatur de aere alieno statis pensionibus solvendo, quin totum in praesens restituere possit. Ad haec igitur incommoda vitanda quaesitum fuit an semota quavis alia earundem sectarum participatione, hoc saltem liceat, nomen proprium in sociorum catalogis retinere, necnon in praefatae taxae vel aeris alieni solutione stato tempore perseverare.

Quod dubium sane gravissimum, cum SSmus D. N. Sacrae huic Supremae Congni commiserit enucleandum, eadem S. Congregatio, re mature perpensa respondendum censuit: "Generatim loquendo non licere: et ad mentem. Mens est quod ea res tolerari possit sequentibus conditionibus et adjunctis, simul in casu concurrentibus, scilicet: lo. Si bona fide sectae primitus nomen dederit antequam sibi innotuisset societatem fuisse damnatam. 20. Si absit scandalum vel oportuna removeatur declaratione, id a se fieri ne jus ad emolumenta vel beneficium temporis in aere alieno solvendo amittat; a quavis interim sectae communione et a quocumque interventu, etiam materiali, ut praemittitur, abstinendo. 30. Si grave damnum sibi aut familiae ex renunciatione obveniat. 40. Tandem ut non adsit vel homini illi vel familiae ejus periculum ullum perversionis ex parte sectariorum, spectato praecipue casu vel infirmitatis vel mortis; neve similiter adsit periculum funeris peragendi a ritibus catholicis alieni."

Quae SSmo Dno et Papae Leoni XIII relata fuerint, in totum approbata et confirmata fuerunt. Verum cum de re gravissima atque periculorum et difficultatum plena agatur, quae plurimas non modo dioeceses, sed et provincias ecclesiasticas respicit, idem SSmus Dnus jussit ut uniformis regulae servandae causa, impletis omnibus quae hoc decreto statuuntur, casibus particularibus Eminentia Tua et in Apostolica Delegatione successores providere possint.

Quae cuncta et singula pro munere meo significaverim, universa Tibi fausta ac laeta a D. O. M. adprecor.

Eminentiae Tuae

addictissimus, obseqmus fam. verus

L. M. *Card.* PAROCCHI.

Romae ex S. O. die 18 Januarii, 1896.

Delegato Apostolico ad catholicos in Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis Statibus.

CONFERENCES.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW undertakes to answer in this Department questions of general, not of merely local or personal, interest. Our readers will understand that there are topics in moral theology which may not be discussed in public print, and also, that it is not our purpose to conduct purely private professional correspondence. We shall, however, accommodate ourselves as far as we prudently can to the numerous wants of the reverend clergy.

THE EDITOR.

ANTICIPATING AN "INTENTION" FOR MASS.

Qu. Usually I have a stipend for my daily Mass. Sometime ago I had none and in vesting for Mass the thought came to me: Make the application of this Mass according to the intention of the person who will give you the next stipend. Could this be lawfully done?

Resp. No. Positive law is against it, and for obvious reasons, since the intention of the celebrant to offer to God a request *not yet definitely formed* by a person not known, is no intention, at least, in the sense that it answers the wish of one who desires to have a Mass said for a special object. Hence Clement VIII in a Decree, 15 Nov. 1605, prohibits such anticipation of vague intentions. "Non potest Missa anticipate celebrari et applicari pro eo, qui primo stipendium seu eleemosynam dederit." (Cf. Adone Lib. iii n. 834.)

CÆSAREAN SECTION AFTER DEATH.

Those to whom the care of souls is entrusted are sometimes brought to the sick-bed simultaneously with a physician who whilst perhaps without religion himself, would be disposed to accept the suggestion of the priest to perform an operation which admits of a chance to administer baptism.

The case is not infrequent when a mother dies in her sixth,

seventh, or eighth month of pregnancy. The dead body of the mother often encloses the living infant. If Cæsarean section is at once performed, the child may be saved and even grow up. In most cases it can receive baptism. St. Raymond Nonnatus was so produced from the body of his dead mother, whence he received the name *non-natus* that is "not born," though he lived a very useful life to the age of 37. But it requires sometimes, as we said, the suggestion of the priest or some member of the family, because many physicians are averse to perform such operations, partly because as a rule the child dies soon after being exposed, partly because the mother may not be really dead, and, as has sometimes happened, come to life under the cut of the knife, which complicates matters and generally results in her death from fright or bleeding, etc.

We reprint therefore the following case to show the practical possibility and use of the operation, at the same time mindful of the caution that the priest should not go beyond the mere suggestion of a means the practical feasibility of which must be left to the judgment and discretion of the physician.

The case is reprinted in the January issue, No. 4, of the *Medical and Surgical Reporter* from a German periodical on Gynaicology. We give it in the exact words of the report:

CÆSAREAN SECTION AFTER DEATH.

Hoffmann (*Centralbl. f. Gynäk.* No. 50, 1895) was called in consultation last summer about moribund patient, aged thirty-six, in the eighth month of her fourth pregnancy. She had previously been in good health. Over an hour before Hoffmann attended her, sudden and violent eclampsia occurred, and deep coma followed. Morphine injections, inhalations of chloroform, and ice-bags to the head were tried. Hoffmann found the coma complete; an hour after his arrival the breathing ceased and the pulse rapidly disappeared; artificial respiration proved useless. Ten minutes after the last respiration Cæsarean section was undertaken. The incision into the uterus passed through placenta along its whole length. The uterine cavity was then laid open above the placental insertion, close to the fundus, and the fœtus delivered. It was a male, nearly fifteen inches long. For a few minutes it did not breathe, then respiration set in spontaneously, and it cried out. The child was fed with a spoon, but could only swallow a very little milk. It died when twenty-five hours old. Hoffmann agrees

with von Winckel that it is a duty to do Cæsarean section under the above circumstances. Of thirty-two children thus delivered after the mother's death eleven lived over a fortnight. Considering that they must already have shown great resisting power and that after all they were saved, when without operation all the thirty-two would have been sacrificed, Hoffmann holds that similar attempts to save the fœtus in future will be more than justifiable.

MEMBERS OF PROHIBITED MASONIC SOCIETIES.

We have on previous occasions pointed out in the REVIEW the attitude of procedure which a priest should take in regard to enforcing and applying the Decrees of the Sacred Congregation on the subject of condemned Secret Societies. For whilst such Associations are wrong in principle and a positive danger alike to Church and State, many of their members have joined them in good faith and for the mere purpose of deriving legitimate temporal advantages from the association. In such cases it is within the province of Apostolic Delegation to use discretion in enforcing the law—not, indeed, by yielding the principle of Catholic truth and its sincere profession, but without needlessly sacrificing those temporal advantages to which equity entitles a member of Mutual Beneficial Societies. The following answer to an important *Quaesitum* proposed to the Holy See gives us the true view to be taken of the matter:

"Quaesitum fuit an Semota quavis alia participatione sectarum, earundem hoc saltem liceat, nomen proprium in sociorum catalogis retinere, necnon in praefatae taxae vel aeris alieni solutione stato tempore perseverare."

The answer was: "*Generatim loquendo non licere: et ad mentem.* Mens est quod ea res tolerari possit sequentibus conditionibus et adjunctis simul in casu concurrentibus, scilicet. 1. Si bona fide sectae primitus nomen dederit antequam sibi innotuisset societatem fuisse damnatam. 2. Si absit scandalum vel opportuna removeatur declaratione, id a se fieri ne jus ad emolumenta vel beneficium temporis in aere alieno solvendo amittat; a quavis interim communione et a quocumque sectae interventu, etiam materiali, ut praemittitur, abstinendo. 3. Si grave damnum sibi aut familiae in renunciatione obveniat. 4. Tandem ut non adsit vel homini illi vel familiae ejus periculum ullum perversionis ex parte sectariorum, spectato praecipue casu vel infirmitatis vel mortis; neve similiter adsit periculum funeris peragendi a ritibus catholocis alieni."

"Quae cum Ssmo. Dmno. N. Papae Leoni XIII relata fuerint, in totum approbata et confirmata fuerunt. Verum cum de re gravissima atque periculorum et difficultatum plena agatur, quae plurimas non modo dioceses sed et provincias ecclesiasticas respicit, idem Ssmus Dmus jussit ut uniformis regulae servandae causa, casibus particularibus Eminentia Tua et in Apostolica Delegatione successores providere possint."

See the full text of the Document on page 361.

THE OFFICES OF THE PASSION "AD LIBITUM."

Qu. The *Baltimore Ordo* states that the Offices of the Passion on Fridays in Lent (dupl. maj.) are "ad libitum." Please inform your readers whether the "ad libitum" means that we are free to choose the Ferial Office on such days and accordingly say a votive or requiem Mass.

If not, what does the "ad libitum" mean?

Resp. The Offices of the Passion assigned for the different Fridays in Lent are obligatory where they have been inserted in the Kalendarium by order, or with the approbation, of the Ordinary. The phrase "ad libitum" means that the Holy See does not place them on the general Kalendar as obligatory, but that they may be adopted, for a time or permanently, in the local *Ordos*.

In the case of the Baltimore province these offices were granted at the special request of the bishops in the fourth Provincial Council, who desired to change somewhat the order of the offices from that which is found in the Roman Breviary (See AMERICAN ECCL. REVIEW Vol. VIII pag 378).

By this act the offices became obligatory, so that they could be transferred in case a feast of higher rite occurred on such Fridays, provided the transfer could be made within the Lenten season. (AMERICAN ECCL. REVIEW. l. c.)

Hence these offices *ad libitum* are obligatory being adopted into the Kalendarium, and they rank above any feast of lower rite occurring on the same day. A Carpo[1] says of the offices which are granted by Apostolic indult "quamvis

1 Compendium Bibl. Liturg. P. ii, c. xiii, n. 179.

porro sunt *ad libitum*, Clerici tamen (sive saeculares sive regulares) qui ad horas canonicas oligantur, *tenentur recitare* Officia votiva ex indulto Apostolico concessa, si jussu Ordinarii (vel superioris regularis) apponuntur in Kalendario diebus non impeditis."

Such is not the case with the other Offices *ad libitum* found in the Breviary. These can not be transferred nor is their recitation obligatory unless the Bishop prescribe it so.

CIVIL MARRIAGES AND THE NUPTIAL BLESSING.

Qu. 1. Are we permitted to give the Nuptial Blessing to Catholics after they have contracted marriage before a justice of the peace?

2. Is it advisable to do so publicly?

3. Should we induce them to receive this blessing, or is it obligatory?

4. Is the mutual consent to be renewed on such occasions?

Resp. Since marriage, in the New Law, is a Sacrament, Catholics who, without necessity, contract it before a civil magistrate offend against religion.

This offense increases in gravity when the act gives public scandal.

In both cases Catholics, before being admitted to the solemn privileges of the Church, must make good the offense committed. Thus far they are to be treated like all sinners (private or public, according to the circumstances) against religion.

Where, as in some dioceses, special censures are attached to the offense, these must be removed. Witness the following for example: "Quod si qui, in iis missionibus ubi sacerdos invenitur, coram ministello protestantico, vel etiam *magistratu civili* matrimonium inire audeant, poenae excommunicationis se subjiciunt: et in nullo casu ad sacramenta permittantur appropinquare, *nisi prius facta poenitentia aliqua publica, vel saltem post culpae confessionem in scriptis*

obtentam. et coram populo ab ipsis, vel a sacerdote, ipsorum nomine lectam." (Cf. AMERICAN ECCL. REVIEW, vol. viii, page 303.)

The renewal of mutual consent is natural and advisable but not necessary, unless where it had been conditionally given, or in places where the Tridentine law against clandestinity is in force, or also in cases where by reason of some other canonical impediment the marriage consent was null and void.

For the rest, the S. Congregation of the *Poenitentiaria* has laid down explicit directions on this subject, for the guidance of pastors, in an Instruction of 15 Jan. 1866 (Collectan. Cap. P. II, tit. 1, Cap. VIII, n. 1406).

According to this Instruction persons who may be obliged by the law of their locality, or who, for good and valid reasons deem it expedient to ratify their marriage contract before the civil tribunal, are to be *first married in the church.* If the reason of force on the part of civil law, or some other equally urgent necessity obliges parties who wish to marry to present themselves first before the civil magistrate, and then only in the church, the two acts are to be, as far as possible, in immediate succession.

"Quod si opportunum est ac expedit ut fideles, sistentes se ad actum civilem peragendum, se probent legitimos conjuges coram lege, hunc tamen actum, antequam matrimonium coram Ecclesia celebraverint, peragere nequaquam debent. Et si qua coactio, aut absoluta necessitas, quae facile admittenda non est, ejusmodi ordinis invertendi causa esset, tunc omni diligentia utendum erit ut matrimonium coram Ecclesia quamprimum contrahatur, atque interim contrahentes sejuncti consistant."

With us, therefore, persons who contract marriage before a justice of the peace in places where they can have the ministrations of the Church, are to be treated like all other contumacious offenders against the laws of the Church. They are to be persuaded to become reconciled, that is, to confess and accept the proportionate penance according to the gravity of their sin.

If the law requires that they present themselves before the justice of the peace, they can do so, ordinarily, only *after*

having received the nuptial blessing. Where the civil tribunal insists, under penalty, on an inversion of this order, the nuptial blessing should follow without delay, and the civil act is to be regarded in the light of "sponsalia."

In such casesthe Holy See enjoins prudence on the part of pastors: Hac in re multa uti debebunt cautela ac prudentia, *et Ordinarii consilium exposcere; atque hic facilis ne sit ad annuendum, sed in gravioribus casibus hoc Sacrum Tribunal consulat.*—(Collectan. l. c. n. 6.)

THE CORRECT PRONUNCIATION OF "ELEISON."

Allow me to say a few words in the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW concerning the common pronunciation of the "Eleison," in which the two vowels *e* and *i* are contracted into one syllable.

Considered from a grammatical and etymological point of view this pronunciation appears to be false. It is unnecessary to enter here into the old discussion lately revived by the French Minister of Instruction, whether in the pronunciation of Greek the Etacism of Erasmus or the Itacism of Reuchlin is the more correct. "Eleison" (ἐλέησον), being the imperative aorist of the verb ἐλεέω, has four distinct syllables. There is no verb ἐλείω. According to Etacism which is adopted in in the liturgical books the η in ἐλέησον is written and pronounced in Latin as *i*. The union of the two vowels *e* and *i* into a diphthong is, however, shown to be wrong, from the derivation of the word.

Of greater moment than the philological argument is the uniformity of liturgical observance, especially in regard to the "tremendum mysterium." The remarks of Pope Pius IX, addressed on one occasion to the singers in the pontifical chapel, is noteworthy in this connection. After the services of the solemn mass they presented themselves and he greatly praised them for their excellent performance, "but," he added, "we know no *eleison;* only an *ele-i-son;* pronounce it thus henceforth."

All the new editions of the Missal, Gradual, Vesperal, approved by the Holy See emphasize this pronunciation, which should be reason enough to induce us to adopt the *ele-i-son* in place of the ordinarily but wrongly pronounced *eleison.*

E. P.

BURIAL OF NON-CATHOLICS IN CATHOLIC CEMETERIES.

Qu. There are in this section of the country a great many cemeteries which are not consecrated, although they are owned by Catholic congregations and destined for Catholic burials only. Each grave is blessed separately at the time of burial.

The question has been raised here lately whether there is any law or rule of the Church which would prevent a Protestant, infidel, or public sinner from being buried in such a cemetery? The question is most practical. Cases not unfrequently occur in which persons, entitled by deed or certificate to be buried in a certain lot of such a cemetery, die outside of the Church and deprived of her sacraments. They could not legally be buried in consecrated ground. But must the burial of such persons be admitted in what is to all intents and purposes, and in public estimation, a *Catholic* cemetery, simply because it happens not to be consecrated? The civil law will, I believe, follow in this the rule of the Church.

Resp. We are not aware that there is any ecclesiastical law or rule against burying the bodies of non-Catholics in cemeteries owned by Catholic congregations, so long as such cemeteries have not been consecrated for the exclusive use of Catholics who die in communion with the Church. The only way in which the property of a Catholic cemetery, whether it be consecrated or not, can be vindicated for the exclusive use of the faithful, is the drawing up of certain regulations in which are made absolute conditions for the legitimate sale or transfer of burial-places. Where this precaution has been neglected, no redress can be looked for if those who have purchased a lot claim it when they mean to use it for burial. The late Bishop Baltes in one of his Pastoral Instructions called attention to the wisdom of con-

veying only *Licenses to bury* instead of giving *Deeds* which convey the ownership of property in the lots of a cemetery. A license to bury may always be refused where the conditions laid down for a proper ruling and management of the cemetery are not complied with ; whereas a deed of ownership is an instrument that ignores such conditions as are required by the Church.

OBJECTIONABLE CUSTOMS IN THE EXPOSITION OF THE BL. SACRAMENT.

We take pleasure in publishing the following letter from a prelate whose efficient care for the honor of God's House may be recognized in the splendor and decorum of many churches in his diocese as well as in the perfect observance of rubrical requirements in his Cathedral.

I beg to call your attention to a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, with regard to the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, in the hope that if the matter commends itself to your judgment, attention may be called to it at some convenient time in the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW. The enclosed decrees show that the practice commonly followed in this country is not in accordance with the Rubrics.

Attention also might be called to another custom, which prevails rather extensively, namely, of placing on an altar a Thabor for the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. If you have at hand the work of Barbier de Montault, Vol. I, on the construction of churches, you will find very severe criticism of this modern French device.

Dubium.

Utrum tolerari possit usus statuendi crucem super throno, et in eo praecise loco, super quo publicae adoratioui in ostensorio exponitur SS. Eucharistia ?

Resp. Negative. Die 2 Junii 1883, (Cuneen, n. 5874.)

In connection with the above *Dubium* the Bishop of Cuneo (Prov. Turin) had asked the S. Congregation whether the crucifix might be placed upon the corporal which serves for

the Ostensorium when the Bl. Sacrament is exposed. "Num tolerari possit crucem ipsam superimponendi corporali?" To this the answer was likewise: *Negative.* (Id Cuneen.)

A writer in the "Ephenurides Liturgical" (Vol. Vi, Dub. Liturg. solutio pag. 695) comments upon this answer of the S. Congregation as follows:

"Ergo usus praedictus damnandus est atque eliminandus, prout abusus et corruptela. Eo ipso quod simplex Crux collocatur super thronum, in quo cum baldachino exponitur SS. Sacramentum, thronus eum Caldachino non am, plius tribuit SSo. Eucharistiae honorem omnino specialem, extraordinarium, qui deberet comitari ac manifestare ipsius exepositionem. Baldachinum reservatur specialiter SSo. Sacramento publice exposito, rei ipsi contentae sub sacris speciebus, non vero figurae, id est tamquam Regi, Christo publice exponendo sen exposito. Consuetudo non est invocanda, prout manifeste repugnans ac contradicens Caerem. Ep. et pluribus Decre Sis S. R. C. quae damnat Falem consuetudinem ut abusum."

It follows that the proper place for the cross is not in the place where the Bl. Sacrament is usually exposed, but either above or back of the same or, although less appropriately, in front of the tabernacle.

As for the artificial supports placed upon the table of the altar, or the awkward arrangements called Thabors, they are unrubrical. The Clementine Instruction expressly ordains "ut Tabernaculum seu *Thronus cum superimposito Baldachino* in quo Ostensorium collocandum est, *in eminentiori Altaris parte assurgat* velisque sit instructus albi coloris" (Instr. Clem. § V n. 1). The altar of the Bl. Sacrament is supposed to have a *covered* throne constructed of stone, wood, or metal, above or back of the Tabernacle. This applies to all public expositions of the Bl. Sacrament. (Cf. Commentar. ad Inst. PP. Clementis XI, § XXXVI).

BOOK REVIEW.

PHILOSOPHIAE THEORETICAE INSTITUTIONES secundum doctrinam Aristotelis et S. Thomae Aquinatis. A Benedicto Lorenzelli, Phil.. S. Theol , utriusque Juris Doctore. Editio altera notabiliter aucta et emendata.—Two Vol. 8vo XXVIII, 332; XX, 528.—Romae: Typogr. S. Propagand. Fid. 1896.

It is a noteworthy fact that the Sovereign Pontiff has by a special Brief given his approbation to the above work in its second edition. This naturally suggests the question: What is the particular feature of Mgr. Lorenzelli's book which merits so high a distinction? In the numerous works on mental philosophy published within recent years, the authors, whether Jesuits, Dominicans, Benedictines or Seculars have been careful to follow out the lines indicated by Leo XIII, and they have moulded their texts and comments "ad mentem" or "secundum doctrinam" of St. Thomas. They have also taken account of the progress of science and analyzed modern errors with a view to refute them by the approved weapons of Aristotelian reasoning. In this direction Mgr. Lorenzelli among the rest deserves indeed particularly well. His *Psychologia generalis*, which he aptly subterms *Biologia*, is full of arguments directed against recent developments of the so-called Darwinian and Spencerian schools whose disciples are not content with the conclusions of their masters, although their psychology is a misnomer, since it ignores the essential element of human life, and deals only with its corruptible phases.

But a much more distinctive characteristic of the learned author's work is to be found in the fact that, apart from his "up to date" methods, he closely adheres to the commentary on the *Summa* by the great Dominican Fr. Thomas de Vio, afterwards known as Cardinal Cajetano. Well has Ughelli (Italia sacra I, 544) said of this wondrous genius, whom not the reasoning but only the perverse will of the German so-called reformers could baffle: "Hic ille est alter Thomas, ingeniorum extrema linea, doctorum virorum miraculum,

haereticae pravitatis terror . . . Thomisticae doctrinae galeatus defensor . . . cujus adeo immortalia scripta sunt ut tamdin videantur perennatura, quamdin divinam sapientiam scholastica subsellia personabunt." This work which constitutes the first of complete commentaries to the *Summa* of the Angelic Doctor is of a truly classical type. Pius V caused a revised edition to be published, and this has become the text of subsequent editions. It is well known with what singular partiality Leo XIII has regarded Cajetan's splendid work, causing it to be printed in the grand edition begun some fifteen years ago by the late Cardinal Zigliara.

To those who are familiar with the history of philosophy, going back to pre-Tridentine days, the name of Cajetano links itself at once with the famous controversial issues regarding the *scientia divina*. We shall not enter here upon a discussion of the subject, but wish merely to refer to the attitude which our author takes toward it in following Cajetano, who, whilst he does not speak of a *praedeterminatio* such as his successors evolved, does nevertheless, we believe, claim a larger interpretation for his *cooperatio intrinseca Dei* than would be admitted by the *concursus simultaneus* of Duns Scotus or the Molinists. Our author, in reasoning on this intricate subject of the union of the divine cognition with the divine will, holds that the conditioned act of the "liberum futurum" which will never happen, is the object of the divine cognition *only in so far as it is considered in union with the divine will.* The proposition which makes for the *scientia media* as standing midway between the *scientia simplicis intelligentiae* and the *scientia visionis* consists of two disjunctive members one asserting possibility, the other asserting reality:

"In contradictoriis singularibus de futuro in materia contingenti non datur determinate veritas in una parte, et determinate falsitas in altera parte, sed datur veritas et falsitas vel in una vel in alia parte, seu sub disjunctione, sane omnis enuntiatio affirmativa eo modo est vera, quo modo est id quod dicit esse, etc. . . . Sed singulare futurum contingens nec est determinate, neque non est determinate, sed potest esse et potest etiam non esse, et solummodo necesse est ut sit vel non sit." He then demonstrates how the *singulare futurum contingens non sit determinate, neque determinate non sit*, and thence concludes that it is impossible to obtain sure and definite cognition concerning future contigent events (singularibus) because such knowledge can be derived neither from the events themselves—as they have not come to pass—nor from their con-

tingent cause, which is not yet determined (ad unum); such knowledge then can be derived only from a cause transcending all necessary and contingent cause. But this cause is God Himself, who in the conscious knowledge of Himself sees from all eternity and throughout all time whatever exists.

Cardinal Satolli in his previously published tract "De Operationibus Divinis" (p. 71) practically enunciates the same doctrine, when he writes: "scientia media dicatur in Deo, quatenus connotatione terminum habeat ad alterutram contradictionis partem circa contingentia futura, v. g. si Petrus constitueretur in his adjunctis peccaret aut non peccaret, ante actum divinae voluntatis tamquam primae universalissimae causae, caret objecto suo."

Thus Mgr. Lorenzelli's work comes to us with high sanction. No serious student of philosophy can afford to set aside the considerations which this preference awakens. Wisdom is a vital requisite to real progress in these days, as much at least as it was in those of a wise ruler who whilst he followed a right philosophy could say to us: "Si intraverit sapientia cor tuum, et scientia animae tuae placuerit; consilium custodiet te, ut eruaris a via mala, et ab homine qui perversa loquitur." (Prov. II., 10–12).

THE MONASTIC LIFE, being the 8th volume of the FORMATION OF CHRISTENDOM, by T. W. Allies, K.C.S.G.—Kegan Paul, Trench & Trübner, London, 1896.

This is the 8th volume of a work, which has gained the author great distinction, if not readers. By reason of its very excellence, it appeals chiefly to the few who are at once scholars, readers and thinkers. The "Formation of Christendom," of which *Monastic Life* forms a part, might as truly be called the "Philosophy of History." Mr. Allies' key-note, during the forty-five years of his Catholic life, has been the Papacy. He has been the champion of Peter's Primacy ever since the day when he discovered that the allegiance to the Holy See was transferred by Act of Parliament to the Crown of England. In the course of seven volumes, which are truly *pièces justificatives* of St. Peter's claims, he sets forth the origin of the Apostolic See, its fortunes and its inner life. No chain of evidence is wanting. The third volume treats exhaustively

of Greek philosophy ; the seventh of Mahommet and his system, the most deadly enemy of the Christian name. The title sufficiently indicates a new triumph for the Papacy. It is called "*Peter's Rock in Mahommet's Flood.*" The eighth volume completes a certain aspect of what we may call Papal Philosophy, without necessarily closing the whole work. It treats of the monastic life with the detail peculiar to Mr. Allies. Here, as everywhere else, he grounds himself upon the philosophy of history. The East was the cradle of monasticism. St. Athanasius, himself a disciple of St. Anthony, proclaimed the tidings in the West ; Rome heard him, and approved, (340). It was a critical time. Constantine had just restored peace to the Church, and removed the fear of a bloody persecution. On the other hand, reaction produced its special dangers, which did not allow Christians to lay down their arms. St. Gregory could say of his own time, *habet pax nostra martyrium serum.* The secret of Egyptian deserts met the hidden need of souls, which was rather felt than expressed. From the beginning Rome had witnessed individual calls to the perfect life. St. Athanasius gave it force of law, by making it into an institution, which took root between the year 340 and the birth of St. Benedict in 480. First there was the monk ; then the rule, which was to communicate unity to the whole institution. Mr. Allies sees another deep reason in monastic vows. God has His house as He has His designs. The life of Benedict offered the most perfect contrast to the life of Mahommed. The false prophet inaugurated sensuality as a principle, and preached a gospel of the flesh, which would have destroyed society to its foundations. Over against Mahommed's harem the Church set forth not only the ideal Christian marriage, but also the soul's mystical union with our Lord, the renunciation of the world and of legitimate affection. According to the Master's words, the crucified have found happiness. Mr. Allies has ingeniously put together the monks' own testimony, speaking in the titles of their monastic houses. The chosen retreats called the "Fair Place," the "Good Place," the "Beautiful Place," the "Gate of Heaven," the "Crown of Heaven," "God's Portion," the "Harbour of Sweetness," the "Joy," (p. 203,) reveal in their names a well-spring of joy in those who had renounced all earthly delights. Monks have also contributed largely to the happiness of the world, for, if the rule of St. Benedict has made saints, it first civilized the barbarian. The monk prepared the way for that Empire of the West, which the Pope crowned in

the person of Charlemagne. The glorious past of the Church offers the best guarantee for the future in the lasting aristocracy of holiness, *casta generatio cum claritate.*

'ΑΛΗΘΗΣ.

ESSAI SUR LA NATURE DE L'INSPIRATION des Livres Saints par E. Levesque. Extrait de la Revue des Facultés Catholiques de l'Ouest.—Angers: Imprimerie Lachèse et Cie. 1896.

The author believes that the prevailing view regarding biblical inspiration is at fault in as much as it confuses the ideas of *inspiration* and *revelation.* He is quite familiar with the views of our later writers, who in the manner of Cardinal Frauzelin pretend to distinguish between the two divine actions of inspiration and revelation, whilst, in reality, he says, they confound the two notions: "après avoir distingué entre l'inspiration et la révélation dans les notions préliminaires, tous ou près que tous, je ne sais par quel oubli ou par quelle pente fatale, en arrivent, dans l'analyse du mode d'action de l'inspiration, à les confondre" (pag. 4).

The analysis of the distinction is interesting and will be somewhat new to many students. Revelation, says M. Levesque, is a gift by means of which we *come to know a truth* which lies outside of the reach of our intelligence (qui échappe à l'intelligence); inspiration on the other hand is a gift bestowed not for the purpose of making us receive or know a truth, but for *transmitting it faithfully.* In revelation the intelligence is passive, it receives truth; in inspiration, on the contrary, it is active, it sets forth and transmits that which it has naturally or supernaturally acquired. The sacred writers transmit many truths, some of which were revealed to them and others they could have known naturally, but in either case this knowledge which they received or already possessed, was independent of inspiration. In inspiration God acts upon the mind, not by revealing anything, but by *directing the intelligence toward such truths or facts*—whether they be known by revelation or otherwise—and urging the writer to set them forth. Hence it is plain that revealed truth as well as natural truths may become the object of the divine inspiration; but the revelation as well as the acquisition of the truths and facts set forth under the present influence of inspiration might have taken place long before and wholly independently of the impulse which caused the sacred writer to commit them to paper.

Thus God dominates the action of the inspired writer toward choosing, arranging, disposing the material already in his possession (either directly or otherwise acquired), and thus becomes the principal author, the first cause dominating the second. M. Levesque does not hesitate, with the above distinction in mind, to declare for verbal inspiration. But his verbal inspiration does not mean the same thing as that which is rejected by most modern writers on the subject. What they reject is the notion of an inspiration in which the very words were *revealed.*

We see at once how useful the distinction between revelation and inspiration, as maintained by our author, becomes, for, although it leaves us practically where we were before, we have certainly an additional reason for not accepting verbal inspiration in the usually received sense. If that sense is faulty, it must be charged to the prevalent conception of inspiration commonly defined as an impulse, which, whilst it moved the writer, also illuminated his mind by setting before him the truths which he was to communicate. This naturally included revelation in the conception of inspiration, although the former might exist without the latter. Father Bruneau's contention in his article on Inspiration in the last number of the REVIEW, receives some light from this essay of the learned Frenchman, which comes quite opportunely.

DELL' UNIONE DELLE CHIESE. Risposta al Patriarca Greco di Costantinopoli.—Salvatore M. Brandi, S.J.—Roma: A. Befani, 1896. 16°, pp. 80.

Our readers are familiar with the famous Encyclical Letter [See AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, vol. xi, pag. 143] in which Leo XIII somewhat over a year ago invited the separated Christian communities throughout the world, to return to the unity of Faith.

The Patriarch (schismatic) of Constantinople thought it his duty to oppose the plea of the Sovereign Pontiff who had addressed himself in a special manner to the Eastern churches, because, though alienated from the central head of the one Catholic Church they still represent in their form of worship, and in many of their dogmatic beliefs, the oldest form of Christianity. The letter of the Patriarch advising the Greek clergy and laity not to listen to the voice of Leo, XIII bears throughout the tone of haughty denunciation, which reveals to some extent the motive of his opposition. It is in

fact nothing more or less, than an appeal to those old prejudices which have kept the Western and Eastern peoples apart on religious as on national grounds. And in pursuing his policy the Patriarch finds it necessary to weave a tissue of erroneous statements, supported by garbled quotations concerning Catholic doctrine and historic fact. Thus by devious reasoning he succeeds to conclusions which are misleading in principle and slanderous in their application.

It may have pleased and satisfied the schismatic clergy and the people who felt that they ought to assent to what their Patriarch says :—

"Ay, he spoke Greek ;"

but no doubt those who "understood him smiled at one another and shook their head." One cannot help regretting, that some Protestants amongst us who could so easily have verified the untruthfulness of the Greek churchman, both as to facts and reasoning, should have thought it good policy to approve the letter. The *Independent* gives us a fine specimen of its critical acumen in matters that concern the Roman Catholic Church, when it speaks of this piece of ill-disguised Greek diplomacy as a document of which "in vigor and directness of statement it would be hard to find its superior in encyclical literature. With merciless logic (*sic !*), with caustic words and with a severity of tone which suggests indignant challenge, it proceeds to show that the Church of Rome itself broke the bond of unity between the East and the West, that the innovations in the Latin Church since the Seven Ecumenical Councils are numerous and divisive, and that its assumptions of superior authority are baseless," etc., etc.

Indeed ! Such statements may be taken in good faith by a clergy not recognized as very superior in learning, and by those generally who depend for their light and guidance on the Patriarch of Constantinople, but they cannot be accepted by any one who has read the Christian Fathers (even in Protestant editions and with annotations that show an absolute anti-Catholic bias), unless he be grossly ignorant of early Christian history, or prejudiced. Some of the facts (!) which the Patriarch alleges do not only admit of a diversity of interpretation, but are discredited by every honest historian of the Greek Church itself.

Fr. Brandi has, with accustomed readiness and unquestionable erudition, analyzed the spurious logic and laid bare the falsifica-

tions of this truly *Greek* Encyclical. He shows how the Patriarch, at the very outset, confounds the idea of immutability in the Church with the notion of immobility, and points out that development of doctrine far from being a change, is an essential element of vitality in the divine organism of the Church. He then taking up argument after argument, statement after statement, convicts the Greek Patriarch of garbling citations from Greek and Latin ecclesiastical writers, of misreading and misinterpreting the sources to which he refers, even in S. Scripture, by quoting without reference to the integral context, of repeating threadbare historic falsehoods often refuted by the Greek historians and sometimes by the testimony of his own predecessors on the patriarchal throne.

Through all this network of misleading argument, faulty citations and shameless insinuations Fr. Brandi traces the old evil of jealousy regarding the prerogatives of the Eastern churchmen, which have kept up perpetual intrigues for maintaining the old prejudices and ignorant views among the people.

The reader may convince himself of the truth of our statements by carefully reading the translation of Fr. Brandi's Rejoinder, which appears in the current numbers of the REVIEW.

PONTIFICALIA. A Description of the Things, Persons and Principal Actions Employed in Pontifical Functions. By the Rev. Patrick O'Leary, Dean, Maynooth College. —Dublin: Browne & Nolan, 1895,

We have here in convenient form the contents, substantially, of the *Ceremoniale Episcoporum*, with references mainly drawn from Martinucci's Commentary on the rubrics. The title itself, which Father O'Leary has given his book, sufficiently indicates its practical value. Since it was meant for English readers, and does not pretend to be a mere translation, we are of opinion that it would have been better to omit some parts and fill the space with some answers directly practical, instead of referring us to other sources for complementary information. Thus, to cite but one example, in the Chapter on "Masters of Ceremonies," we read (n. 18): *that they may have such food and clothing as becomes their position, and that their minds should not be fatigued and distracted by many cares, and that, removed from all other concerns, they may the more easily apply themselves, etc., etc.* Of this sort of information we find a

good deal in the comparatively small volume of 264 pages, whilst for many obvious duties of the Master of Ceremonies we are referred to special instructions. Some of the rules given are so remote from the conditions of actual practice that their observance would be more fault than virtue, as "*when the Ordinary preaches, no sermon is allowed in any church of the Episcopal city* at the same hour, without the consent (at least, tacit) of the Bishop." There is no noticeable attempt to render the reading of translated parts smooth and at the same time intelligible. Withattention, in a new edition, to these features of a manual designed for practical use, the "Pontificalia" will prove a valuable addition to the liturgical library of the English speaking clergy.

HOMILETICAL SERMON SKETCHED ON THE SUNDAY EPISTLES. Drawn up by a committee of priests and edited by the Rev. W. M. Cunningham.—London: St. Anselam's Society. 1895. Pp. 149.

These sketches have their principal worth in the fact that they deal with the Sunday *Epistles*. There are numerous expositions of the Gospels, and our people naturally become familiar with the various aspects of the topics suggested in the readings from the evangelists. But there are comparatively few helps which explain the Epistles; although these are often really difficult to be understood without the special help of a well informed exegete. In the booklet before us we find lessons drawn from the Sunday Epistles which without being in each case a complete analysis of the same, are suggestive of the motive, and can easily be worked into a complete and rounded sermon. It is a fresh addition to the work of Sermon Sketches carried on in the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW for several years, and to the recently published work in two volumes by Fr. Howe ("The Catechist.")

OUTLINES OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. By Sylvester Joseph Hunter, S.J. Vol. III.—London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1896.

With this volume the Course of Dogmatic Theology, belonging to the excellent Stonyhurst series, concludes. The work of Father

Hunter possesses the special merit of completeness as an outline of Catholic Doctrine. We see the teaching of the Church as the bearer and interpreter of divine revelation in its systematic coherency. The large field of free theological opinions regarding doctrines and traditions within the Church could not, of course, have been covered in a manner to satisfy the specialist student in theology, but the reader obtains something like a bird's eye view which is apt to fix upon his mind the distinctive landmarks that separate truth from its semblance and controversialist encumbrances. Each chapter begins with a prospectus, in which the plan of the treatise and the state of the question under discussion is clearly defined; and each chapter ends with a brief recapitulation of the preceding argument separating the principle under defense from the differences of views which may be taken of it in its application.

This method is, as we have intimated in reviewing the two former volumes of the present work, eminently satisfactory; and the theological reader realizes the fact particularly in the treatment of topics contained in the chapters on "Grace" and "Justification" with which the present volume opens. The freedom of the human will and the foreseeing dispensation of grace which creates a strong impulse in the soul, have aroused the speculation of keen minds endeavoring to explain the divine action without contradiction. Thus numerous schools of theologians have been formed, among whom are the so-called Thomists, with Billuart as their principal champion; the interpreters of St. Augustine; the Molinists who hold a *scientia media;* the Congruists who follow Suarez, and the compromise school of the Syncretists who have likewise a Jesuit, Petavius, among their foremost defenders. All these, though they differ in the method by which they would explain the divine influence upon the human soul, agree without excepion on the fundamental doctrine of the Catholic Church, namely, that the will remains free in the performance of meritorious (salutary) acts, whilst at the same time grace is an essential requisite for the performance of such acts. Thus the different theologians employ only different weapons, weapons which will not match with each other, to confute the common error of the two extremes maintained by the Pilagians and Calvinists respectively. Our own author adopts with preference the system of Molina, as do indeed most Jesuit authors; but he gives us also an honest indication of the real value of the dissenting opinions.

The chapters on the "Sacraments" and the "Last Things" with which the work ends, are written in a like spirit and form. A good Index makes the book doubly useful not only to the young theological student but to the intelligent lay reader who would possess himself of a comprehensive and systematic view of Catholic teaching.

We notice some slight errors in the paging of the "Contents" in front, pp. 107 for 111; 108 for 112.

QUESTIONS OF HONOR IN THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. By Katharine E. Conway, Boston: Pilot Publishing Company, 1896. Pr. 50 cents.

This is the third volume of Miss Conway's "Family Sitting Room Series," and we cannot let it pass without a word of comment which may appeal to the clergy. To suggest that this little book represents an important chapter in pastoral theology must seem exaggeration. Yet to know what goes on in the home and society where those of our flock hold converse, who, as the dedication words say, have "in a special way the honor of our holy Faith in their keeping"—this is worth more to the missionary priest than the mastery of scholastic categories. It is true that "Questions of Honor" gives us but a very brief and limited glimpse into ordinary home-life; but that glimpse is given in the flash-light of Catholic truth which perpetuates the impression received from its everlasting source. Thus the priest who in a more special way than any "Child of Mary," has in his "keeping the honor of our holy Faith" is made to feel more correctly and strongly the sympathy of views and aims which animates the choicer elements of Catholic society.

Can we do anything better than take up, and keep up, in sermon or conference the judicious treatment of the subjects which possess the thoughts of those among the laity who love virtue and would compel its diffusion? Here are, in familiar form, practical religious topics as they fashion themselves in the minds of intelligent Catholics—"The Courtesies of God's House"—"The Letter and Spirit of Sacred Seasons"—"Snobbery in Religion"—"Refinement and Beauty in the Externals of Religion"—"The Liturgy and the S. Scriptures"; such are the main themes touched lightly with a woman's knowinghand, but pointing to a thousand resources of musical development in the pastoral sphere.